DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 183 HE 007 615

AUTHOR Tollefson, Arthur L.
TITLE New Approaches to College Student Development.
INSTITUTION Behavioral Publications, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 156p.
AVAILABLE FROM Behavioral Publications, Inc. 72 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011 ($9.95)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; Educational Development; Educational Innovation; *Educational Objectives; Equal Education; *Higher Education; Individualized Programs; Minority Groups; Models; Personnel; Remedial Programs; *Student Development; *Student Personnel Programs; Student Personnel Work; Students; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Student development has come to have a special meaning that focuses on activities undertaken for the educational benefit of the student outside the traditional purview of the professor. It has a positive educational rather than administrative aspect that has come to be associated with student personnel work. This accentuating of the positive has stimulated a reassessment of the status of the profession. However, the new focus has brought problems with it. Chapters cover: (1) the philosophical and historical developments in higher education in terms of implications for student development; (2) programs that provide opportunities for the educationally disadvantaged; (3) programs that provide more personalized services for other kinds of students; (4) curricular innovations; (5) efforts to recreate a sense of community; (6) a summary and analysis of these trends; and (7) an attempt to construct a model which incorporates the principles underlying the basic trends. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

I. INTRODUCTION

The original purpose of the study was to "provide college administrators and specialists charged with responsibility for student development, particularly the development of students from disadvantaged backgrounds, with new, functionally viable operational principles and specific methodologies synthesized from published research, and from identifiable innovative experiments." The task, then, was to identify new approaches to student development, to synthesize these approaches into emerging trends, to discover the principles underlying these trends, and to try to understand something of the implications of these trends for student development and for higher education in general.

Inevitably, it was necessary to make choices. It became evident that there were literally hundreds of approaches that were new in some significant way. The approaches which are reported are illustrative, not comprehensive. Clearly, the nature of the research involved is not what is commonly termed basic research. Instead, it is research of a survey type. Neither is the study definitive because the rapidly evolving nature of the subject makes such a study impossible. Instead, it is an exploratory study focused on determining "the state of the art," on gathering together examples of successful attempts to meet student needs and making such information available to others in a condensed form.

This study focuses on new practices in student development rather than in the more traditionally termed field of student personnel work, although the terms sometimes may seem to be synonymous. It took the demise of "in loco parentis" for the common function of core student personnel work roles to be identified as student development rather than student control. Yet, just as counseling was too narrow a definition to cover educative tasks that include environmental management, so student development taken at its literal meaning is too broad in that it would logically include those learning experiences commonly supervised by the faculty, i.e., subject-matter professors. However, for want of a better term, student development has come to have a special meaning that focuses on activities undertaken for the educational benefit of the student outside the traditional purview of the professor. It has a positive, affirmative, educational connotation rather than the frequently negative, constricting, administrative aspect that has come to be associated with student personnel work.

This accentuating of the positive has stimulated a reassessment of the status of the profession. It also has fostered an awareness of opportunities and responsibilities for more active, creative involvement in the education of the student.

However, the new focus which has emerged has brought problems with it. Most obvious is the lack of proven, standard methods to meet educational needs of students in areas previously largely ignored. This is why it has been important to identify promising and successful new approaches to student development. A second general problem is that not all of those who are to bear responsibilities in these areas are well prepared to undertake the tasks that are being assigned to them. One group which exemplifies this problem are those educators from minority racial groups who have been installed as administrators and specialists in development programs for the disadvantaged or in other student personnel positions primarily to provide minority representation, but who have not had much specific preparation for their tasks.

A second group are white educators who also have been recently recruited from outside the ranks of the student personnel professions. Former classroom teachers, coaches, clergymen, businessmen, retired military personnel, and recent student body presidents are found in this group. They generally have admirable characteristics highly adaptable to their new positions but lack specific knowledge of appropriate methodology.

A third target group are people who have functioned for some time as student personnel professionals and who have special need to reorient and reeducate themselves to the emerging trends in student development. To varying degrees this group includes almost all experienced student personnel professionals. But those in colleges somewhat out of the mainstream perhaps need special help.

Although these were the original target groups, it has become evident that the study has produced findings which have important ramifications for all college and university educators.

A study such as this which seeks out "new, functionally viable operational principles and specific methodologies" is almost inevitably going to challenge tradition and suggest what some may regard as radical changes. If the innovations truly get at the root of things (and "radical" is derived from the term meaning "root"), some vested interests are likely to be threatened. Another hazard is that synthesizing new approaches into emerging trends and principles can be, perhaps will be, affected by selective bias despite efforts to avoid such bias. A third danger is that some of the changes noted may be rather temporary accommodations to relatively short-term crises. Today they may appear to be far more significant than they will be tomorrow.

As serious as these dangers are, at least some of the new approaches appear to reflect certain key trends. These trends point to a radical, even if evolutionary, remodeling of colleges and universities toward revitalized educational colonies and away from elitism, narrow philosophies of education, and depersonalized environments.

To describe these trends and to indicate their import, this report has been organized as follows. Chapter II focuses upon philosophical and historical developments in higher education in terms of implications for student development. It also describes the methodology of the study. Each of the next four chapters focuses upon one of the clusters of new approaches which indicate a major trend: Chapter III describes programs that provide opportunities for the educationally disadvantaged; Chapter IV presents programs that provide more personalized services for other kinds of students; Chapter V focuses on curricular innovations; Chapter VI describes efforts to recreate a sense of community. Chapter VII summarizes and interrelates these trends, resulting in conclusions and some implications pointing to a resurgence of concern for student development, and possible major restructuring of the entire philosophical and organizational patterns which now pervade higher education. Chapter VIII is an attempt to construct a model which incorporates the principles underlying the basic trends. To give support to the concept that the model is not simply a philosophical dream but a practical possibility, the practicality of key features is reinforced in most cases by reference to one or more programs in which that feature is a current, functioning reality.

II. THE RESURGENCE OF CONCERN FOR STUDENTS

During the last two decades, a cluster of legal actions and other general social developments have had direct effects upon policies in colleges and universities governing admission of students. Beyond this, in some institutions, policies affecting the degree of control over the behavior of students and student involvement in academic affairs also have undergone marked changes. Key among the legal actions were the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and a number of court decisions redefining student-college relationships with reference to the rights and responsibilities of students to manage their personal affairs.

Kinds of Students

In addition to the direct consequences of legal actions, there have been political, economic, and social pressures which have resulted in colleges accepting increasing numbers of students quite dissimilar in background from that of the conventional or typical college student. The traditional student generally has been characterized by being white of skin, in the age range from 17-22, and from middle-class or higher socioeconomic backgrounds. Additionally, the traditional student has been found academically acceptable with reference to admissions requirements, which usually are based on quality of high school grades and academic aptitude test scores.

The Academically Atypical New Students

The students who do not fit the traditional pattern and who have been the major beneficiaries of recent actions and pressures have come to be labeled as "new students" or the "new breed." The only commonality the majority of them have with the traditional students is that most of them are also 17-22 years of age, although even the age range tends to be extended upward. They tend to be either brown or black in pigmentation, from lower socioeconomic levels, and often are unable to meet the regular admissions requirements.

Academic admissions requirements have been the most generally recognized barrier to the admission of these new students. Financial factors, lack of awareness of opportunities, and lack of motivation also have played a part. So has official or unofficial racial discrimination: official in the South and unofficial in many colleges in the rest of the country.

student was also relatively affluent because many poor students could not afford college.

The G.I. Bill and other financial aids have made colleges more economically accessible. As a result of financial help and the third generation phenomenon, today many white students are from non-Anglo-Saxon, non-Protestant lower socioeconomic classes. They tend to be commuters. They may be bilingual but are not highly proficient in English. They are culturally and economically very different from the truly typical college students whom they may outwardly resemble.

In brief, students today who are accepted under regular admissions requirements are by no means as relatively homogeneous in age, attitudes, values, needs, or even background as were the college students for whom the traditional program was designed. Apparently the reordering of student development priorities stimulated by concerns for the disadvantaged has fostered a greater sensitivity to the heterogeneity of all students. As a result, new, and often highly personalized services are being developed to meet the needs of both typical and atypical students admitted under regular admissions standards.

Changes in Colleges

The colleges attended by today's students are in a number of ways dissimilar to those attended by typical students of a generation ago. Students of previous generations most likely would find today's colleges strange, bewildering, and more than a bit frightening. The nature and quality of interpersonal relationships and educational interactions that take place in and around them are grossly different. Most institutions are several times larger than they were a generation ago. Greatly increased demands for services to groups other than students have dramatically changed the college environment and affected the orientation and priorities of educators.

Changing Philosophical Patterns

Different colleges have tried to meet these challenges and opportunities in various ways. The aim of this report is to describe some of the

ED121183

NEW APPROACHES
TO
COLLEGE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Arthur L. Tollefson

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Human Sciences
Press
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

HE 007 615

Behavioral Publications, Inc.
New York

Library of Congress Catalog Number 74-3392
ISBN: 0-87705-173-9
Copyright © 1975 by Behavioral Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, microfilm and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing from the publisher, with the exception of the United States Government, which is permitted to reproduce this work in whole or in part for any purpose.

BEHAVIORAL PUBLICATIONS, Inc.
72 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011

Printed in the United States of America
56789 987654321

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Tollefson, Arthur Leroy.
New approaches to college student development.

Bibliography: p.
1. Socially handicapped children–Education (Higher)–United States. 2. College students–United States. I. Title.
LC4091.T64 371.9'67 74-3392

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments v

I. Introduction 1

II. The Resurgence of Concern for Students 4

III. Programs for the Disadvantaged: A Move Toward the Democratization of American Higher Education 28

IV. The Return to Personalization 57

V. Innovation in the Curriculum: Complement to Student Development 69

VI. The Search for a Community Concept 87

VII. The Brave New World of Higher Education: Summary and Some Implications 102

VIII. Some Suggestions for Facilitating the Evolution of Programs of Higher Education Focused on Student Development 113

IX. References 137

Appendix A 140

Appendix B 144

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report on new trends and practices in student development was made possible by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. OEG-0-72-4332) to the Human Interaction Research Institute. The author of the report was the Principal Investigator and Edward M. Glaser, PhD, President of the Human Interaction Research Institute, was Project Director.

As Project Director, Edward Glaser has played an invaluable role not only in managing the administrative aspects of the project but also in functioning as a sensitive and insightful counselor and critic. As a skilled researcher, psychologist and educator who has not been closely identified with student personnel work, he has frequently challenged the professional biases and the too often highly internalized assumptions of the Principal Investigator.

The contributions of the several hundred college and university educators who nominated and described programs in student development were essential to this report. Their professional concern deserves much credit.

Warm appreciation is due those colleagues instrumental in making on-site visits to selected campuses both professionally worthwhile and personally very pleasant. Philip Beal, John Blackburn, Don Creamer, James Duncan, James Kuder, Thomas Magoon, Glen Nygreen, Ludwig Spolyar, Louis Stamatakos, and Douglas Stutler each provided help far beyond the requirements of professional courtesy.

Special thanks is extended to Channing Briggs and other officers of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators for their endorsement of this project, and for their help in supplying names and addresses of potential contributors.

In addition to editorial assistance, Kathalee Garrison has performed an indispensable role in coordinating activities of people who have been widely dispersed geographically. She also has had primary responsibility for most other day-to-day administrative aspects of the project. Her intelligent, efficient and cheerful performance of these often frustrating tasks has made the work of everyone else much easier. Her contribution to the project has been most significant.

Particular recognition must also be given to Paul Bloland, Ramon Chacon, Gordon Gibb, Robert Goodenough, Paul Greenberg, Lonnie Harris, Clifford Houston, Molly Lewin, Charles Lewis, William McLean, Lynette Robe, Irwin Sarason, Goodwin Watson, and C. Gilbert Wrenn for their various contributions as consultants and editors. Without their help a complex task would have been much more difficult.

For their help in the not-always stimulating task of reviewing the literature in the field, thanks go to Peter Boyse, Charles Schroeder, and Robert Seeborg.

Especially helpful was Mona Luebbert for her patience and flexibility in typing several drafts under sometimes trying circumstances.

For personal support and for encouragement to present what have seemed to be logical but also likely to be controversial analyses and interpretations, sincerest thanks go to several very important people, some of whom have been named above and some of whom have not.

Arthur L. Tollefson

Now these new students are in college. Some are almost illiterate from a functional point of view. Some are militant. Many have life-styles, needs, and orientations considerably different from the traditional student.

Non-academic Differences among Traditional Students

Students who today generally are thought of as the traditional variety have met regular entrance requirements, do not suffer from unusual economic handicaps, and are not members of the ethnic groups against which obvious discrimination is applied. Yet, they often are different in their expectations or outlook on life from students of a generation or even a decade ago. While many hold to the value system, life-style, and generalized behavior patterns ascribed to the typical traditional student, a very substantial number of them have interests, needs, and values which are not well served by the equally traditional educational programs. There are a variety of sub-groups, including the conventional-appearing students with excellent academic records who are nevertheless political and social activists; those who are almost fanatically religious; the drug users; and others who come from traditional backgrounds yet are identified with the counter-culture.

Other Atypical Students

Still other students fit into neither the traditional nor new student categories, although they usually meet entrance requirements that are not too selective and probably have both socioeconomic and gross ethnic characteristics of traditional students. These include "returning" or older students, commuter students, those with severe physical handicaps, and students from white ethnic groups which have not been proportionately represented in college.

Curiously, while the disproportionately low representation of racially identifiable ethnic groups in colleges and other bastions of middle and upper-class socioeconomic groups has been frequently noted and much discussed, similar but less extreme differences in proportion are also notable for certain white nationality groups. Apparently it generally takes three generations for significant numbers of descendants of immigrants to move into the American mainstream (Mead, 1965, pp. 45-49). Consequently, only now are descendants of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe entering college in numbers more proportionate to their representation in the general population. (Immigrants from these areas arrived in large numbers between 1890 and 1920.) Therefore, the stereotyped traditional student has not only been "White" but also "Anglo-Saxon" and "Protestant" which adds up to a very definite "WASP" image of the historically typical college student. The traditional college innovative and seemingly more effective ways to cope with, or perhaps to capitalize on, the changing needs and conditions in our colleges and in our society. Our tentativeness in describing the effectiveness of these methods is made necessary by the fact that outcome evidence is inadequate at this time; however, no tests of statistical significance are necessary to become aware that something very important is happening in higher education. It is becoming increasingly apparent that a new educational philosophy, or at least a major modification of the old, is emerging at the college and university level of American education. One way in which this is evidenced is by the appearance of an array of programs, curricula, and other procedures relating to student development that are markedly different in style, direction, and focus from those which previously dominated the scene. All indicate a resurgence of concern for the student as a person, for how his needs and interests are being served, and for how effectively the institution is educating him to achieve his personal goals and preparing him for his role in society. Such broadly based concern for what happens to the student as a total person has not been much in evidence during the period when institutions increased so rapidly in enrollment. Perhaps such a concern for all aspects of the individual student's development has not been seen since colonial times. But why have the shift of attention to the student and the emergence of a variety of new approaches to student development occurred at this time? Conversely, what has been wrong or dysfunctional with traditional approaches? To put what is happening into proper context, a review of the development of earlier philosophical positions bearing upon college student personnel functions is in order.

Earlier College Attitudes

From time to time throughout the history of higher education, major shifts in the philosophical and psychological bases have occurred with dramatic and often traumatic results.

The first major orientation (approximately 1630-1850) was the one dominating colonial colleges. The purpose of colonial colleges was to train clergymen and other community leaders. Their emphasis was on moral and religious matters with heavily Calvinistic overtones in most cases. The typical age range of students was from 14-21, and because of primitive transportation and communications systems, they were isolated from their parents. The natural outcome was what has come to be known as the "in loco parentis" concept. Student development approaches were heavily oriented toward control of the students and inculcation of moral and spiritual values as well as intellectual achievements. Every professor and administrator was expected to share actively in these responsibilities.

While these colleges were established in a land presumably dedicated to democratic concepts, the perspective of colonial leaders with regard to democratic or egalitarian concepts was constricted. Further, they patterned these colleges upon an English model that had evolved from feudal times. As a result, colleges of today retain a number of feudal vestiges, such as academic rank, which are more significant than the academic robes used on ceremonial occasions. Academic rank, unlike administrative rank, does not directly signify that higher ranks indicate larger burdens or greater competence. Instead, such rank stems from feudal class ranking via the ecclesiastical system from which medieval colleges developed. These vestiges have continued to be a part of the academic tradition and have served to interfere with what seems to be an increasingly democratic philosophy of higher education.

The second philosophy (approximately 1850-1940) focused almost exclusively on intellectual development. It had its origins in a concept of higher education imported from Germany, where great emphasis was placed upon intellectual and personal freedom for all scholars--both faculty and students. In the United States, the emphasis on academic as well as on personal freedom for faculty found a place in a number of the most prestigious universities. These freedoms have been essential to the research efforts and intellectual attainments which characterize such universities.

On the other hand, the concept of freedom for students in either their academic or their personal lives was not acceptable in a society dominated by the Puritan ethic or in colleges led by key administrators and trustees who had been indoctrinated in the philosophy of the colonial colleges (Williamson, 1961, pp. 432-435). Thus the American adaptation of the German philosophy essentially denied to the students the freedoms so valuable to the professors.

During much of the period in which this philosophy represented the dominant point of view, almost all colleges were quite small. An informal, personal relationship between students and faculty was almost inevitable. Further, and critically important, most students were drawn from an intellectual and financial elite in which attitudes of family and social class exerted an exceedingly strong "cultural press" for students to conform to university requirements. Consequently, despite a preeminent focus on the intellectual aspects of a student's life and a disinclination on the part of professors to become involved with the students outside the classroom, the normal daily contact between students and faculty was reasonably comfortable and compatible.

In these institutions, the responsibility for student discipline, control and caretaking generally was regarded as the responsibility of the Dean of the College and later the Dean of Women and Dean of Men. These and other special personnel were hired for the specific purpose of attending to students' out-of-classroom needs. This was in large part an effort to see that such problems would not interfere with the primary, indeed almost the sole function of the institution, that of developing the student's intellect.

As such institutions attained large enrollments, it became apparent that the student-faculty relationship, depending as it did almost entirely upon student and professor getting to know each other through classroom-related interactions, was fragile indeed. With larger classes and fewer courses with any given professor, the student seldom had opportunities for truly personal contacts of sufficient frequency. He knew the professor only as a subject-matter expert. Nor was he known by the professor except as a name, perhaps a face, and more likely a grade.

It is not surprising that such institutions, despite their academic excellence, have often come to be characterized by a coldness and hostility between students and faculty, by depersonalization, by "sink or swim" attitudes. Today, vestiges of this philosophy are most evident in universities where "publish or perish" is the critical criterion determining the standing of faculty members. Given the lack of warmth and corresponding lack of concern for the student as a total person that tend to pervade the atmosphere of such institutions, it is not surprising that many of these colleges and universities have been particular targets of student activism focused upon demands for change of internal policies and procedures as well as common scenes of confrontations on national issues.

The Currently Dominant, Meritocratic Orientation (Approximately 1940-Present)

The focus on research and intellectualism as well as other factors in the general society produced another shift in philosophy. The "meritocratic" philosophy that emerged focused upon producing professionally and technologically trained individuals, not upon developing liberally educated community leaders nor upon pure intellectual scholarship. As the potential practical benefits resulting from the utilization of the scientific approach became evident, the demand by industry and society as a whole for professionally qualified experts who could produce superior goods and services became overpowering. Not only were faculty much influenced to focus their attention on research and consulting because of direct rewards, but there also was a tendency to focus the content of courses and of curricular patterns in the direction of facilitating job-getting by students. Given the socioeconomic conditions of the times and the dominant needs of students of those times, this was inevitable. Such a focus was to be expected in professional schools. However, liberal arts colleges also developed highly channelized vocational patterns, most typically toward teaching, business, religious vocations, and professions requiring graduate training. Not surprisingly, many beginning courses assume that students are pre-professionals in an area directly dependent upon the academic discipline of the course.

As a result, colleges and universities have tended to be organized almost completely to foster expertise in subject-matter disciplines, ultimately to serve some economic function or social need for professional services. In this case, the consequences have been borne by enrolled students.

There are a variety of ways in which students have paid the price. Curricula often have been constructed for administrative convenience rather than for congruence with known patterns of human development. For example, research on vocational interest patterns of college males indicates that vocational interest patterns do not generally crystallize into adult patterns until these young men are in their early twenties. Yet many colleges demand commitment to a major in the freshman year when these students are 17 or 18 without any real check to determine if the student's interests are mature.

A more universal consequence is that educational needs in areas other than vocational have virtually been ignored, especially in the curriculum. To take courses to learn how to deal with people (e.g., in psychology), for sheer enjoyment (e.g., in art), to better understand the ecosystem (e.g., in biology), or to learn how to cope with our political system (e.g., in political science) has been likely to be disappointing because the courses did not serve those objectives. If the student is unconcerned about rat behavior in psychology, cares not one whit about art history, or otherwise ignores aspects of the given subject which are of presumed importance to budding professionals or to a professor's prescription of what students ought to learn, but of little consequence to the explicit objectives of this non-professionally oriented student, he is likely to be given failing grades. The reason he does not learn what he desires to learn is that those particular topics are very unlikely to be covered in either those specific courses or elsewhere in the respective disciplines of most colleges which focus upon vocational objectives.

In effect, students have been forced to adapt their objectives, interests, and needs to the rigidly established offerings, regulations, and organizational structures of the institution rather than the institution's tailoring its programs to meet student developmental needs. In essence, colleges dominated by a meritocratic philosophy are not designed to serve the developmental needs and patterns of students. They are designed to serve the presumed needs of employers and are organized for the convenience of administrators and faculty.

A second characteristic of meritocracy has been an emphasis on student selection rather than student development. As college candidates became more abundant, selection among them on the basis of "merit" became more predominant. Such selectivity was regarded not simply as acceptable but as desirable in terms of providing highly qualified experts to society and also in terms of economic efficiency in educational programs. The use of selection methods based on preparation and academic skills is almost unassailable if there has been equal opportunity to obtain the necessary skills and knowledge. Selection criteria, however, have almost always favored the applicants from educationally and financially advantaged homes who attended good to excellent schools.

As a consequence, many disadvantaged students who have the potential to become highly qualified have been judged for merit and found wanting before the correctable deficiencies resulting from their disadvantaged backgrounds could be remedied. This phenomenon has been shown to be systematically related to ethnic and economic factors, not to random factors related to genetic or other variables almost impossible to control.

Although this pattern of selecting the best prepared without considering the unequal opportunities to obtain such preparation has probably been highly efficient in terms of a cost-benefit ratio, the results for disadvantaged students have been tragic.

Philosophies in Conflict

Given the current state of social concern for the ethnically and economically disadvantaged, for the ecology, for peace, for social justice, for constructive use of leisure, and for other non-vocational concerns, the perhaps too pervasive focus of higher education on vocationalism and selection for "merit" based upon unfair criteria may seem to imply a lack of professional competence and sensitivity on the part of college educators. Such an implication is unfair to some extent because it ignores the social matrix and the level of psychological sophistication concerning student development which existed at the beginning of the meritocratic era.

Following World War I, increasingly sophisticated psychological methods were developed for assessing human intellectual capabilities, special aptitudes, interests, and other characteristics. Psychologists became prominent because of their demonstrated capabilities in selecting the most academically able students, in diagnosing remediable deficiencies, and in rehabilitating those individuals who encountered difficulty despite the careful selective and diagnostic processes. The "adjustment" psychology that developed was focused upon adjusting students to meet the rigorous and generally rigid requirements of the college. In more competitive institutions, these methods were used to select students. Little emphasis was placed upon adapting the resources and procedures of the college to meet the needs of the student, especially if those needs and interests pertained to aspects of the individual's development other than the purely intellectual or vocational.

The Student Personnel Paradox

It may seem somewhat paradoxical that many of the psychologists and student personnel administrators who were leaders in the development of techniques to facilitate the adjustment of students to college requirements also were those most instrumental in formulating and promulgating the "student personnel point of view." This point of view contains the following five "principles" (Williamson, 1961, pp. 13-19):

1. Central concern with all aspects of human development
2. Attention to the unique individuality of each student
3. The assertion that teaching in the classroom is not enough, or sufficient, in the education of some students
4. An insistence upon the use of methods and relationships of an educative rather than an authoritarian or chain-of-command type
5. A focus upon the incorporation of new knowledge of human nature and its development into educational programs and services

It is, of course, debatable whether these are indeed the principles or concepts which should undergird either the education of college students in general or the student personnel services functions in particular. It is not very debatable that these specific principles, or ones very much like them, have been those taught to at least two generations of graduate students planning to enter college student personnel work and generally accepted by them in terms of a basic philosophical orientation. People who were taught this point of view today occupy most of the key leadership positions in student personnel professions.

It would seem logical from the perspective of today to expect that the psychologists and student personnel specialists would have recognized the paradox. On the one hand, they were aiding a system to become increasingly selective and elitist, as well as increasingly rigid in its demands that students adjust to its academic requirements. On the other hand, they were verbally fostering the idea that the institution should adapt to meet the needs of the student. Indeed, a number of these leaders in the field of student development did recognize at least some of the underlying inconsistencies. However, the realities of the situation they faced must be placed in perspective.

First, the trend toward selectivity in all but a few colleges did not gain much momentum until after World War II. Only a few colleges or universities, generally of the Ivy League type, were very selective. Before World War II, most public institutions were legally required to accept all graduates of accredited high schools within the state who applied for entrance.

Similarly, testing and counseling as standard skills of trained professionals in student personnel work received their largest impetus after World War II. Both counseling psychology and student personnel administration were in very early stages of development as clearly identifiable professions. Indeed, those who have done most to provide the earliest theoretical and philosophical bases for college counseling and student personnel work were just beginning to establish their professional reputations. Several of these people are still very much in evidence as active leaders in these professions. As young men and women, they were able to do much to foster greater theoretical sophistication among those colleagues across the nation who held student personnel positions. Unfortunately, they seldom were in positions of power to make the changes needed.

In addition, the post-war student "bulge" so strained available facilities that the realistic question was not whether all people with potential should be educated, but which ones could be most quickly processed so that the institution could serve the largest number. The students who were the primary recipients of concern were the veterans who qualified for special educational benefits without regard for ethnic or socioeconomic antecedents. Indeed, the very democracy of the G.I. Bill in eliminating prior bias was much touted. Merit, not money, was viewed as the new and more just criterion for college admission and retention. Conversely, to admit people who had little likelihood of success seemed both rather inhumane and a waste of valuable and limited resources. As educators employed to work with students, not non-students, these professionals could apply the student personnel point of view only to those the institution chose to accept, not to those who didn't fit the existing structure. Consequently, scientific selection and professional counseling of college students were really first applied in a major fashion to the burgeoning masses of students who were children of the Great Depression and "overage" veterans anxious to acquire vocational skills and obtain economic security. They were also well trained both by their parents and by military service to accept the dictates of authority figures.

It was only after the educators and legislators became aware that the tremendous increase in demand for higher education was something more permanent than a "veterans bulge" that highly selective admissions criteria became common. Even then, the availability of community colleges and other open-door institutions seemed to provide logical and eminently fair opportunities for the presumably "less talented" who were not really "college material."

Not well recognized nor understood at that time was the ethnocentric and socioeconomic bias of the academic program which influenced the development of prediction formulas used to establish admissions requirements and which undergirded the standards and rules under which students were required to compete and achieve. Therefore, efforts to implement developmental concepts were restrained within the confines of regulations, traditions, and priorities of the institution. Consequently, what today can be viewed as inconsistent or paradoxical procedures seemed eminently appropriate and professionally responsible at the time. Given the fact that student development specialists such as counseling psychologists and student personnel administrators were this lacking in insight and professional sophistication, it was unreasonable to expect educators who did not pretend to be specialists in student development to be any more perceptive.

For these reasons, not many were much aware of or much troubled by what now seems an obvious paradox.

Some Merits of Meritocracy

There were other phenomena that reinforced the belief that colleges and universities were doing a fine job. Because colleges, and the professors in them, found themselves dealing with seemingly brighter and better-prepared students as the admissions standards went up and because the capabilities of their graduates seemed to certify the quality of the college and the effectiveness of the professors, most educators came to view the American system of higher education as an unqualified success, despite disturbing signs that all was not well. Attrition rates in the vicinity of 50 percent have been commonly reported in typical four-year colleges for many years. In the late 1950's and early 1960's not only was student apathy prevalent, but many articles and books appeared that were concerned with the lack of creativity characterizing the highly conforming "grade getters" who were being admitted to selective colleges. As indicated in an article entitled "Reflections from Harvard on 1 Million Dropouts" (Roche Report, "Frontiers of Psychiatry," Vol. 2, No. 13, July 1, 1972), many students drop out of college because of problems of personality adjustment rather than for academic reasons.

Despite these foreboding indications, most college educators have continued to regard the American system of higher education as highly successful, and it has indeed been successful, with a number of qualifications. Consider the following:

1. Before World War II, less than 10 percent of an age cohort started college; now more than 40 percent of our youth begin some form of "tertiary" education. Unfortunately, the majority of these students have found themselves in huge educational institutions which often tend to be characterized by mechanized, computerized, and bureaucratized systems that foster depersonalization and feelings of alienation.

2. Although the meritocratic approach, as implemented by sophisticated psychological methodology as well as by the G.I. Bill, the National Defense Education Act, and assorted other student aid programs, has fostered upward mobility for an amazing number of people, it has become obvious that an ethnocentric bias has permeated the process. White Anglo-Saxon Protestants (WASPs) and other advantaged groups (e.g., Jews) have been disproportionately represented in prestige institutions, whereas racial minorities (except Orientals) have been grossly under-represented throughout the system.

3. We have been able to recognize merit and develop talent to complete successfully tasks requiring highly developed intellectual and professional skills, such as putting men on the moon. Our college graduates as a group, however, are not nearly so skilled in solving problems involving interpersonal relations. Although social and cultural development has almost always lagged behind technological advancements with potential commercial or military applications, the gap now has become so great that it is tragic in its consequence for many humans.

These examples (and there are numerous others) indicate that the American system of higher education operating under the meritocratic philosophy has been remarkably successful in providing certain kinds of education for a great many people with tremendous personal benefits to individuals as well as general benefits to society as a whole. However, these examples also indicate that higher education has failed in a systematic fashion to provide other kinds of education to its graduates. Equally systematically, it has failed to serve large segments of the population identifiable by ethnic and economic characteristics.

Confronting the Issues

An examination of these failures strongly indicates that the meritocratic philosophy of higher education has not really been congruent with the "student personnel point of view." Consider how the principles of this point of view have fared.

Although there may have been concern for "all aspects of human development," effective educational implementation appears to have been very lopsided. Even the largest institutions have tried to pay attention to the "unique individuality" of the student, but the aspects of individuality with which the system has tried to cope have been primarily those directly related to academic and vocational goals. How carefully, for example, have most institutions' individualized programs been designed to develop the student's skills in interpersonal relationships?

It may have been asserted that "teaching in the classroom is not enough," but what has happened outside the classroom has certainly not been sufficient to educate students in those areas which the classroom ignored or rejected.

Although "educative rather than authoritarian" methods may have been viewed as desirable for some time, it has taken the demise of the "in loco parentis" concept, the disruptions of the '60s, and the demands for student participation in decisions that affect them to jolt universities and colleagues into considering other methods.

Regarding "incorporation of new knowledge of human nature and its development into educational programs and services," the continued use of culturally biased academic aptitude tests is striking evidence of how this principle has been implemented. The awareness of cultural bias did not result in general changes in selection criteria.

It is evident that despite their fundamental lack of congruence, the student personnel philosophy was coupled with the meritocratic philosophy to produce what has probably been the best system of higher education in all history, albeit one that can only be termed a qualified success. Curiously, its successes and failures have affected not only students but also the educators who serve them.

Educators as Victims and Villains

We have already noted that the meritocratic philosophy fostered the emergence of student personnel specialties as recognized professional roles. We also have noted that it forced these specialists to function simultaneously under two essentially contradictory philosophies. Some of the compromises and confusions that resulted are obvious. Others have been beclouded by a great deal of verbalization about the educational impact of student personnel work and the high status and power attained by key student personnel administrators.

From a practical and realistic point of view, many student personnel people have too often been "paper tigers" whose primary role has been: (a) to keep students within the bounds of what was deemed to be appropriate discipline and control, (b) to oversee activities necessary to the general maintenance and welfare of students, (c) to provide students with certain special kinds of assistance, usually of an emergency or remedial nature, and (d) to attend to miscellaneous administrative tasks that contribute to the institution rather than to the students, and frequently have unpleasant aspects. While graduation is determined by the faculty, the other end of the continuum, academic dismissal, is very often a task assigned to student personnel administrators. Professionally trained student development specialists have been required to handle non-professional tasks (e.g., being responsible for parking lots and traffic violations), while professionally unqualified people have frequently been employed to undertake tasks that have important educational potentialities (e.g., student activities programs which have been geared to "fun and games" rather than to educational purposes).

Tollefson and Bristow (1964) detailed how the willingness to accept assignments, whether or not they are within the purview of the individual student personnel professional's specialized skill and knowledge, has created a vicious cycle perpetuating the second-class status and impotency of student personnel "workers." (Note the use of a term not generally applied to other professionals, e.g., "instructional workers" for professors or "medical workers" for physicians.)

Given the above situation, it is not at all surprising that Penney (1969) was able to argue very convincingly that student personnel work lacks theory and the other characteristics of an identifiable profession. But more specifically he notes the lack of acceptance by academicians, the relegation of personnel professionals to subordinate and peripheral roles, and the fact that students will turn to "fully qualified" specialists rather than those identified as student personnel workers.

There also have been conflicting pressures on the faculty. With few exceptions, they profess to be interested in the total well-being and development of the students with whom they come in contact. Yet the behavior of most professors is not compatible with expressed attitudes. Relatively few are much involved with students outside the classroom. Instead their focus is overwhelmingly on the content of their subject matter, with little regard for what is occurring to the non-cognitive dimensions of the student in the classroom, even though the student may be deeply affected emotionally by what he learns. To be sure, there are a significant number of exceptions, especially in institutions in which good teaching actually has priority over research, publication, and other faculty interests.

But real concern for students and actual involvement in their educational development outside the classroom often have been an expensive luxury for able and ambitious faculty members. Despite avowed commitments to students, many professors have been enticed by the availability of grants and consultantships. These, in turn, lead to publications, to widespread recognition of expertise, and to academic promotions and salary increases, to say nothing of increased immediate income. Thus, the reward system has come to foster a symbiotic relationship between the teaching faculty and non-college agencies in business and government. This has further discouraged faculty from "wasting time" on student involvement.

Since instructional personnel have traditionally determined what the curriculum should contain and have jealously guarded their control, they must also carry the major responsibility for the inadequacy of a curriculum that has reflected another aspect of the meritocratic orientation.

In a paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges, Katz (1972) pointed out that the curriculum is largely determined by the faculty's conception of what knowledge is. This conception is more accurately described as an historical accretion of subject matters from which it is difficult to delete anything and which proliferates to serve the research and status interests of professors. He further points out that despite the fact that proponents of a developmental approach have engaged in research over at least two decades in attempting to measure the impact of curricular and extracurricular factors on student learning, "body of knowledge" advocates have done very little. He suggests that perhaps the reason they have done so little is that prevailing educational practice agreed with their conception. Because of this, faculty interest in peer recognition, status, and pursuit of specialty has reinforced the status quo.

This faculty conception of what knowledge is and what the curriculum should include has been particularly inadequate to meet the needs of new students. Cross (1972) states: "Basically, schools and academic curriculum have been designed by people who are good at academic tasks for people who are good at academic tasks." She points out that "The world's work can be roughly catalogued under three major headings. To put it as directly as possible, we need people to work with people, we need people to work with things, we need people to work with ideas." She further points out that the traditional curriculum has focused primarily on educating people to work with ideas, and that these people may be in over-supply. She also notes that "It is significant that the most urgent present social needs are those in which New Students show particular interest and ability."

The inadequacy of the curricula in fostering human development, developing the capacity to cope with social problems and providing training in practical skills has become particularly evident. Concurrently, the lack of responsiveness to the curricular needs of these new students has generated accusations of racism and militant demands for change. These would have been unnecessary if the system actually had been geared to serve "all aspects of student development" and "the unique individuality of each student."

Student personnel professionals have contributed to the development of this state of affairs. At times they have used their skills and knowledge to reinforce ethnically biased and elitist institutional practices, and implicitly to coerce students to "adjust" to institutional demands rather than taking risks to get the institution to adapt to student needs. But, quite clearly, it has been the dominant cluster, i.e., the instructional faculty and administrators, rather than student personnel specialists, who have been the "immovable object" in responding to development needs of students in recent years.

It would be foolish to imply that there has been any calculated intent to deprive students of desirable and legitimate educational services. Yet, the narrow definition of the appropriate purview of higher education which has been dominant and the impact of a reward system in which concern for student development has low value have produced the same effect as if there had been conscious effort to withhold services. Student personnel professionals and instructional specialists have been as much victims of the system as unwitting villains. They have been caught up in the machinery and forced into roles and actions (or inactions) that are not always those they would prefer.

Changes and Legislative Pressures

It now is becoming evident that the immovable object has been moved, not by the intellectual impact of the "student personnel point of view" and not by related impact of research on student development, but rather by the impact of the irresistible force of the Civil Rights movement and the onslaught of new students.

Almost every college and university today, whether public or private, is involved in programs and contracts depending upon federal funding, including student loan programs, loans for building, and research grants. Should the efforts of colleges to provide educational opportunities to adequately representative numbers of students from racial minorities be less than convincing to the federal government, the government may institute legal action to cut off all federal support to such institutions. Such support is conditional upon meeting certain legal requirements included in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. A typical condition in any kind of contract in which federal financial assistance is given to a college or university program or project is the following:

> The Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000a et.seq., as amended, and particularly title VI thereof, which provides that no person in the United States shall on the ground of race, color, religion, sex, or national

> origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, as implemented by regulations issued thereunder.

On casual inspection, one might be tempted to assume that compliance with conditions such as this would not be difficult as long as standards for admission are stated in objective terms involving only factors relating to academic preparation and indications of academic potential. On closer inspection, of course, it is evident that such an assumption would be naive, for two reasons:

1. It is probably impossible to stipulate measures of academic preparation and of academic potential that are not culturally, and therefore ethnically and economically biased (Grant, 1968). High school grades are grossly biased toward white, middle-class standards. Similarly, standardized tests of academic aptitude are notoriously biased in favor of the upper socioeconomic classes since they are heavily loaded with verbal skills that give a marked advantage to children of well-educated parents. The lack of culturally unbiased alternative measures sets up the college for confrontations on the grounds of alleged discrimination.

2. Those who initiate these confrontations are likely to be the administrators of the federal agencies from which financial assistance is derived. They are empowered to do so through stipulations in these grants, such as the following:

> Noncompliance with grant conditions
>
> In addition to such other remedies as may be provided by law, in the event of noncompliance with any condition imposed pursuant to this Regulation, a grant may be annulled and all (agency name) grant funds recovered or it may be terminated pursuant to Article 5 of the Grant Conditions (Appendix A), the project work may be suspended pursuant to Article 4 of the Grant Conditions, an injunction may be entered by an appropriate court, or such other action may be taken by the Grants Officer as the Administrator shall direct: Provided, That no such action shall be taken without prior consultation with the grantee.

The particular nature and circumstances of the institution may be such that it has great difficulty attracting significant numbers of reasonably qualified minority students. Under these circumstances, the college or university may have to mount a new program for recruiting black and brown students without much regard to educational qualifications or potential in order to protect the rest of its program.

It is a rare college or university that has not yielded to political and economic pressures. As a result these new students, including disadvantaged whites, are present on all campuses. They need and demand new and improved programs and curricula which they regard as relevant to their goals.

The practical answers imposed by political and economic realities generally require a considerable accommodation by every segment of the institution. They also have forced a concentration on student developmental needs and a reappraisal of student development processes and methods. The fact that colleges and universities have admitted these new students is at least a tacit acknowledgement of the elitist nature of the old philosophy. Most fundamentally, however, it is a recognition of practical reality.

In addition to concern for the disadvantaged, recently emerging social and political developments have added impetus to a resurgence of interest in the student and his needs. The recent decline in student enrollments has reduced the need for classroom teachers. Consequently, for very practical reasons faculty are focusing upon recruitment, admissions, and retention policies and practices. The federal government has markedly reduced the availability of research grants and other projects which resulted in the employment of college professors. As these "soft money" assignments have terminated, the professors, most of whom are senior faculty with tenure, must be reassigned to teaching responsibilities or other duties based on "hard money" budgetary resources. Because these budgets are usually related to student enrollment by some kind of formula, the competition for students becomes even more highly intensified. Instead of students being viewed in many colleges and by many faculty as individuals who can accept the college program or go somewhere else, they are beginning to receive solicitous attention, especially those new students and other atypical students who have needs and interests which colleges and universities were not originally designed to serve and which have received little attention in the past. It is the latter group that are most likely to contribute to college attrition figures unless they receive special help.

The Exploratory Nature of the Study

It should be clearly understood that this research effort was designed to be an exploratory, rather than a definitive study. In applied fields based on the social sciences, definitive studies often do not produce data of relatively permanent usefulness. In higher education and many similar areas, by the time a given process is identified in the literature as being effective for students of a given college generation and becomes accepted as standard practice, it is quite likely to be out of date. Indeed, it may well have come to be identified as bad practice. For example, not many years ago, colleges were required to remove any items on application forms or other documents requesting information relating to race. Similarly, they were not allowed to assign students to rooms in residence halls on the basis of race. These presumably good practices were intended to guarantee fair, impartial, nonracist treatment. Today good practice requires that information concerning race be requested to provide statistical evidence that racial minorities are given at least equal treatment. Similarly, good practice in room assignment requires that members of racial minorities not be isolated in a sea of white students by random assignment.

As a consequence of the shifting nature of social phenomena, practices that previously have been adopted generally enough to become standard and which may well have been proven by definitive studies to be very effective for their original purpose, may no longer be acceptable under today's circumstances.

Because of the rapidly changing sociological and psychological patterns in higher education, it seemed far more important to focus on current attempts to deal with current problems of a critical nature than to attempt to undertake research of a type leading to perhaps more definitive but less professionally useful answers. Definitive longitudinal studies to determine the effectiveness of new creative approaches are, of course, highly valuable if the results are really viewed in context. But creative efforts and new program models are necessary when conditions and needs have changed.

The Search and the Response

From this general frame of reference, the search was launched for new approaches to student development.

Several methods were used to seek out promising programs which were attempting to deal with student development problems in new ways. First, recent literature was reviewed. Appropriate categories were used to tap the resources of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). In addition, the issues of the last several years of journals such as The Journal of College Student Personnel, The Journal of Counseling Psychology, The Personnel and Guidance Journal, and The NASPA Journal (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators) were reviewed directly. These published materials yielded relatively little that was not primarily philosophical, theoretical, or descriptive in nature, although some of these articles were quite insightful. Programs about which there were substantial amounts of "hard" evidence almost always related to standard practice. Some articles which seemed to indicate new approaches in their titles contained nothing new except changes in terminology more fitting to the new era of "student development" than to the old era of "counseling and guidance."

A second method for identifying new approaches was more productive. Through the cooperation of the officers of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), a list of over 900 institutional representatives to that organization was provided. These are the officially designated representatives from each college or university having membership in NASPA and most often include the chief student personnel executive (e.g., the Vice President for Student Affairs, or the Dean of Students) for the institution.

A separate list of about 150 other people believed to be exceptionally knowledgeable concerning student development innovations was also developed. Many of these are professors connected with graduate training programs in college counseling and in college student personnel administration. Others included counseling center directors, some college presidents, and a number of present and former colleagues of individuals associated with the project. Thus, approximately 1,100 of the most knowledgeable people in the country were approached for nominations of programs which they considered demonstrable of new approaches to student development. These contacts were made by mail, using two similar letters (see Appendix A). Approximately 200 responses were received.

Several relevant observations can be made at this point:

1. A small number of respondents (about 5 percent) indicated that they had no nominations to make.

2. A larger number (roughly 10 percent) nominated programs and

techniques that have been standard practice for several years in many institutions.

3. The largest number of nominations, well over half, were programs of some interest and potential value because they were exceptionally well-developed examples of standard practices; because they had interesting but not fundamental embellishments; because they were described in terminology indicating an understanding and appreciation of the thrust of the emerging philosophy; or because they otherwise indicated a level of professionalism and currency of thinking that was heartening.

4. The rest, with the exception of those noted below, appeared to contain elements that were really new. Those that seemed to be new but are not cited in this study were either in the same general category as better developed (or at least better described) programs or were in tangential areas that were not readily usable in the context of the main thrusts of the report.

5. A few responses (2 or 3 percent), can only be described as pleas for help of various levels of intensity and desperation.

A screening of the nominated programs identified a number of colleges and universities (Appendix B) with programs that were deemed worthy of on-site visits for either or both of the following reasons: (1) they had highly developed and complex programs in which numerous promising approaches seemed to be in use, or (2) they were experimenting with unique programs having exceptional potential consequences. Visits to 10 of these institutions and follow-up communications with others resulted in the identification of additional promising programs and special insights.

This exploratory research approach has produced evidence of a number of innovative efforts which, taken collectively, suggest the likelihood of the emergence of a much modified philosophical orientation for the system of higher education. It is an educational philosophy that promises to be not only better balanced in terms of providing education in all major aspects of students' lives, but also likely to serve students from all kinds of economic and ethnic backgrounds more equitably. This study has yielded strong indications of dominant thrusts or trends of efforts by various kinds of college educators to meet the developmental needs of students under radically changed and changing conditions. It has not been possible to determine objectively the effectiveness or the potential long-term value of many of these new practices. Future studies must be made to ascertain whether such trends as the following have been successful: democratizing higher education to serve new as well as traditional students; personalizing relationships among all individuals in the college; liberalizing the curriculum to serve all aspects of students' developmental needs; restoring a sense of community to colleges and universities.

Where statistical or other objective evidence has been available to us concerning the efficacy of the technique or program, we have cited such evidence. In other cases, we have had to rely upon the testimony of nominators and/or others, the logic of the approach, and our own professional judgment. In most cases, the acceptance of a program on the basis of primarily subjective evidence has been reinforced by our awareness of similar programs elsewhere. Not the least of the supportive evidence is the mutual testimony given by the seeming agglutination around a single theme of several programs from institutions of diverse types or from widely separated geographical locations.

One note of caution needs to be interjected. Time and again, higher education has been lulled by what might be designated as a false sense of permanency. In the 1940's the expansion of higher education seemed unlikely ever to end. In the 1950's, we were concerned about stimulating the apathetic "silent generation." In the late 1960's, we found ourselves in what seemed to be an interminable state of siege caused by student unrest. Today, there exists a strong concern for the disadvantaged student, especially the minority student.

But the expansion pattern has leveled out, the issues about which the apathetic generation was silent have been vociferously expressed, and a number of accommodations made. The current focus on the problems of both new and traditional students seems to be stimulating some possible answers. The question that logically follows is whether the resurgence of concern for student development is not also more or less transitory. The question is important for higher education in general. For students and student development professionals, the answer to the question is critical. The professional knowledge and skill with which student development specialists devise and apply new approaches will have much to do with their future status as educators. It also will do much to determine the effectiveness with which higher education responds to the changing needs of students of the future.

Capsule Summary

Students on today's campuses are far more heterogeneous than in previous generations. Colleges have also changed. Since World War II, they generally have become much larger. There has typically been a focus on consulting and research in many universities, and a focus on selectivity and vocational training in most institutions of higher education. These emphases have resulted in procedures biased in favor of the educationally advantaged.

Educators who have espoused the "student personnel point of view" advocating concern for the educational development of each individual, not just the elite, and for education in all aspects of every student's life, not only the occupational, have often been forced into passive and ineffective roles.

The acquisition of political power by minorities and other disadvantaged groups plus the consequences of the demise of "in loco parentis" have now forced colleges and universities to give students and their needs much greater attention.

As a result of this resurgence of concern for students, new approaches to serving these needs are being developed. The needs of "new students" and other atypical students, and the non-vocational needs of all students are receiving special attention.

To identify effective new approaches, recent literature relating to student development was reviewed and nominations of effective programs were solicited from over 1,100 leaders in fields related to student development. These findings are discussed in subsequent chapters.

III. PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED; A MOVE TOWARD THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Although a number of variables have contributed to the resurgence of concern for students, the current primary thrust is clearly toward meeting the needs of kinds of students not previously well served by traditional programs, especially those students who have been educationally disadvantaged.

Financial aid has been given for some time to those with reasonably good academic records. Similarly, limited tutorial and remedial assistance have been available to regularly admitted college students. In contrast, special programs for the educationally disadvantaged are relatively new as a general phenomenon in higher education. Why is this happening and what approaches seem promising? Quite clearly, the stimulus to initiate most of these special programs was political in origin. As might well be expected, the initial response was a political reaction.

The Response to "Black Is Beautiful"

With the sudden shift in political climate as a consequence of the Civil Rights movement, special programs for black students were developed on predominantly white campuses. These contained fundamentally the following elements:

1. Waiving regular admissions requirements and opening the door to a reasonable number of black students
2. Providing adequate financial help to defray all expenses
3. Providing remedial and tutorial help to remove or reduce skill deficiencies
4. Providing black studies courses to reinforce black pride
5. Providing supportive counseling help, preferably by black counselors

Superficially, this pattern may seem to have been a fair, sensible and adequate program to recognize the cultural differences of all blacks and to provide compensatory education for those blacks who were educationally disadvantaged. Examined more closely, it is essentially a symbolic gesture bowing to political reality rather than a program carefully designed to meet the educational needs of students admitted under special criteria. First, the emphasis upon black studies and the insistence upon black counselors and program directors bear witness to the sensitivity of higher education to political clout. To be sure, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and white youth from Appalachia as well as disadvantaged youth not so clearly identifiable by either ethnic or regional identification have since been included, but these were brought in later.

Second, the pattern reveals a lack of awareness and sensitivity to the real impact and meaning of cultural differences and to the problems involved in dealing with emotional and educational consequences of 18 or more years of cultural conditioning.

Third, this pattern implicitly assumed that the institution itself was basically quite sound with little need for change (except, of course, for the unfortunate oversight by the various disciplines regarding the contributions of blacks to the total culture).

The problems of trying to develop a program to respond to political pressures rather than to serve student needs began to be evident. Consider the following problems that have emerged on campuses which have based their programs on the political response cited above:

1. On a number of campuses, especially those which have been somewhat selective in admissions practices, little real effort was exerted to get truly disadvantaged blacks. Selective schools have been under considerable pressure not only to admit minority students, but also to demonstrate that they are not merely going through the motions by admitting blacks only to dismiss them later. To avoid negative political consequences for the institution, some black students have had to be evident in a reasonable time among those who graduated. Consequently, the actual effort has not always been to attract disadvantaged black students, but instead to recruit black students who have a reasonable chance for success, which is a very different matter. As a result, competition in selective schools for the sons and daughters of black

teachers, preachers, physicians and other well-educated blacks has been intense. Some schools have never graduated a truly disadvantaged black. The focus is often on the achievement of a reasonable semblance of racial balance for public relations purposes, not on helping the truly disadvantaged. Some predominantly black schools have complained that their best prospects are being raided.

2. Frequently, the conditions and requirements of the educational environment are so radically different and generate so many emotional problems that often the disadvantaged black student simply has not been able to adjust to the new environment. Even remedial courses for demonstrable deficiencies have been viewed as another example of the "white man's put down." The shock seems to be particularly acute and debilitating if the black student group is small so that there is lack of community identification and strength. It is also severe when the cultural distance between blacks and whites is great, as is apt to be the case in a highly selective college.

3. Financial aid in itself is not enough. Many black students have had painful and humiliating experiences because they lacked preparation for handling their own finances.

4. Staff is also inadequate. There are simply not enough qualified black educators with expertise in student development to go around. Many of the blacks who do have even minimally acceptable academic credentials came from the "black bourgeoisie." Consequently, they sometimes tend to be regarded as "oreos" or "Uncle Toms" by the young blacks from lower-class families. They may be viewed with as much distrust and suspicion as a white person, who at least has the advantage of not being perceived as a traitor to his race.

These developments clearly indicate that the black movement for equality was the wedge that forced open the doors of higher education to those who are truly educationally disadvantaged. However, it also became evident that not all blacks are educationally disadvantaged and that not all who are educationally disadvantaged are black. Subsequent developments have made it clear that the primary problem which colleges are being asked to deal with is educational disadvantage, with ethnic and economic factors as related but secondary factors. It became evident that the real need to which colleges must address themselves is the development of sound and effective programs to provide compensatory education including modification of certain attitudes and values to provide real opportunities for disadvantaged students rather than simply to mollify political pressure groups. This has required more complex planning and the development of more comprehensive programs and patterns than the one outlined above. In a more general way, this new commitment has made the trend toward more real equality of educational opportunity seem irreversible for political, legal, and moral reasons (Harper, 1971). It is also a move toward the democratization of higher education which conflicts rather sharply with the ethnic and economic elitism that pervaded the meritocratic philosophy.

Educational Disadvantage and Admissions Criteria Bias

Admissions criteria for almost every college that is at all selective have been based primarily on high school grades and/or some standardized test of college aptitude. Because high school grades are loaded with values and attitudes which reward students from middle and upper classes, these grades are not very indicative of real potential among disadvantaged students. Indeed, a careful analysis of admissions criteria reveals that educational advantage is the primary factor underlying both the presumably more-or-less direct measures of intellectual potential such as high school grades and aptitude test scores, and the so-called "non-intellective" variables found to be most correlated with college success, such as father's occupation (uniformly found to be the best single non-intellective variable), family income, mother's education, etc. The bias in the intellective measures of potential has previously been noted. Similarly, the non-intellective variables cited above are all obviously related to educational advantage. By the same token, the formulas that tend to produce the highest multiple correlation coefficients between the predicted grade achievement and actual grade achievement tend to be those that pile one measure of educational advantage upon another.

Yet, despite years of efforts by hundreds of experts to develop prediction methods which have high validity, such prediction formulas seldom achieve correlation coefficients higher than .50 and almost never above .70 except in very unusual circumstances. Such levels are only a little above chance for groups and absolutely untenable for individuals; i.e., out of a group of 100 applicants having a specific combination of scores, it might be predicted that less than half would succeed if accepted. But one can not predict with any real confidence that a given individual would not succeed if given a chance.

Most of the prediction formulas used for selection have a standard error of about half a grade. This means that, for students predicted to be unsuccessful at a level just below the common 2.0 (C average) level, about one-third would have grades ranging from 2.0 to 2.5, and about one-sixth would have even higher grades. Even for a group predicted to be at 1.5 (which is generally considered to be a very poor grade average), one out of six would receive at least satisfactory (2.0) grades.

Further, almost every prediction formula uses as the ultimate criterion to define success, either first quarter (or semester) grade, or first year grades. Little used as a criterion is the more realistic one of overall academic success upon graduation, or the more meaningful one of professional success after graduation. Consequently, the educationally disadvantaged student who manages to be admitted is measured, and often found wanting, at the time he is suffering most from cultural shock and before he has had a chance to catch up. Therefore, selective admissions contain much of the self-fulfilling prophecy syndrome, i.e., disadvantaged students have trouble behaving like advantaged students because they are not advantaged students and instead behave like disadvantaged students.

There may be some selective colleges and universities with better criteria, better formulas, smaller standard errors, and less obvious bias against the disadvantaged. However, close inspection of the overwhelming majority of these formulas by a technically well-qualified professional would reveal that the most essential characteristic of almost all is the element of differences in educational advantage, not a defensible element of identification of ultimate potential.

For reasons related to the above, selective institutions which essentially base their criteria for admitting disadvantaged students from racial minorities on modest downward revisions of the criteria of grades and test scores tend not to accept the truly disadvantaged members of racial minorities. They admit instead children of the black bourgeoisie and students with Spanish surnames, some of whom may not be able to speak Spanish. Obviously, there are wide ranges in educational disadvantage among minorities also.

Modification of Admissions Policies and Criteria

Although the original impetus for changing admissions and related procedures was a political response to what appeared to be racial bias, there is increasing awareness that the real essence of the matter is educational disadvantage. As more people have become aware of the gross bias against the educationally disadvantaged in admissions, almost all colleges and universities have had to either change to the open door pattern or establish special admissions patterns. There is a general consensus that in selecting truly disadvantaged students who have academic potential, the recommendations of teachers, counselors, and community leaders should be heavily weighted. Subjective judgment, in this instance, is more valuable than statistical predictions. Disadvantaged students are potential exceptions to the basic assumption that the best predictor of future performance is past performance in a similar situation. Evaluations of motivation and attitude are of critical importance with disadvantaged students. Colleges and universities that have revised their admissions policies have found that high-risk students from disadvantaged groups can achieve successfully with proper tutorial, counseling, and other supportive assistance (Green, 1969). Illustrations of contrasting methods of dealing with the matter of admissions for disadvantaged students are the following:

1. The City University of New York (CUNY) in the summer of 1970 began to admit any student graduating from a New York City high school. This new policy ignored all previous criteria. Although open admission is not new, this decision "represented the first massive attempt in the history of American higher education to offer the urban poor an opportunity for free college education" (Mann and Phelps, 1971). Within a year, 76% of New York City high school graduates were enrolled as full-time students in post-secondary institutes. The overwhelming majority of those from low-income families were attending CUNY.

   Among the most interesting specific consequences were that while the white enrollment increased 64%, the minority group enrollment leaped 123%. Of the white population, a notable but statistically undocumented amount of the increase was from so-called "ethnic" groups, particularly Irish and Italian Catholics, rather than from WASP or Jewish groups.

2. Various state college and university systems, including those in California and Oregon, have established quota limitations for admitting students under other than regular criteria. Most common is the "three percent" rule which permits the admissions officer to enroll a number of students equivalent to three percent of the total entering group on the basis of his judgment that evidence other than official criteria suggests that these students have academic potential sufficient to be successful. While such rules are sometimes abused in order to give special consideration to athletes, more generally they have served to admit, albeit rather selectively, disadvantaged students as well as late-bloomers and others from advantaged groups.

   Many knowledgeable administrators feel that the percentage could well be expanded, were it not for budgetary considerations. Since disadvantaged students often need special remedial help as well as direct financial aid, such students are relatively expensive to admit and maintain.

3. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), in its report (1971) entitled The College and Cultural Diversity describes a number of special admissions policies designed to enroll minority students, pointing out that "A few years ago the discussions about recruiting minority students for admission often centered on the lowering, or making exceptions to, standards for admission as represented by test scores..." It further states that the more recent emphasis ignores test scores but instead focuses "... upon such activities as outreach programs and early identification of minority students who might be potential candidates for admission, and upon questions of procedures, both in recruiting and admissions activities, which would assist the student in adjustment to campus instruction and the environment when he enters."

It has become apparent that to make the new admission policies really functional, supportive programs such as those noted below are essential.

Recruitment of New Students

In its monograph entitled The Black Community and the Community College (1970), SREB notes: "The search for black students who might continue their education in the junior college should not be limited to the high schools in the vicinity of the junior college. Some of the best prospects may not be enrolled in high school." It cites the need to contact prospects wherever they may be--on the street, in bars, gangs, clubs, poolrooms, church groups, restaurants, etc.

Disadvantaged students are likely to be unaware of the programs and possibilities open to them. They also tend to be conditioned by life to assume that what is purportedly available is not meant for them. Therefore, they need accurate, up-to-date information plus assurance that support for both their physical and emotional needs is not only theoretically available, but actually accessible. They are likely to need encouragement and help in filling out applications, collecting supportive materials, and otherwise fulfilling the demands of the educational bureaucracy.

Exemplary programs of recruitment include the following:

1. The SREB report cited above describes several notable community college programs which seek out disadvantaged students, utilizing a variety of techniques. Lee Junior College (Bayton, Texas) through its Program Outreach; Gulf Coast Junior College (Panama City, Florida) through its College Career Sidewalk Studio; and Central Piedmont Community College (Charlotte, North Carolina) through its Careers Unlimited program used variations of the same approach. This includes individual contacts wherever such prospective students may be found, followed by group meetings in various convenient locations. Such meetings are used to present programs, discover student needs, and carry out other functions necessary to interest the prospective student, help him complete his application, and overcome other problems. Palm Beach Junior College (West Palm Beach, Florida) established Starter Courses and furnished black counselors to assist prospective students in two off-campus locations. Santa Fe Junior College (Gainesville, Florida) established a day care center for mothers in a disadvantaged area to free them to go to college.

The report also notes the use of outreach centers in or near ghetto areas by Miami-Dade Community College (Miami, Florida). This college also established counseling centers at feeder high schools and uses student assistants to recruit disadvantaged students.

2. St. Petersburg Junior College (St. Petersburg, Florida) utilizes a community services concept that has many of the same general features of the above programs. This program seems to make a special effort to tap the idealism and desire for involvement of enrolled students. They are urged to bring their ideas, talents and skills to the Student Community Services Center and "do their own thing," which includes helping recruit prospective students.

3. The University of Texas at Austin is one of those large and prominent public institutions which finds itself labeled with a racist image. This tends to be self-perpetuating because as long as few minority students are enrolled, few will seek admission. The university is trying creatively to overcome this problem.

   University policies prohibit reverse racism, a circumstance which does not permit the kind of aggressive recruitment outlined above. There are alternative methods, however, adaptable to the constraints imposed by the policy limitations.

   A student and faculty project entitled Project Information utilizes student-faculty teams to inform high school counselors and teachers, prospective students and other Texas citizens, especially blacks and Mexican-Americans, that the University of Texas at Austin is open to students of all ethnic and economic backgrounds. It also tells them about various services that are available: financial aids, tutoring, advising, personal counseling, an ethnic affairs staff, and highly cohesive and supportive organizations of black and Mexican-American students.

   This program does not actually involve recruiting of racial minorities or economically disadvantaged students; instead, it focuses on setting the facts straight.

> Another University of Texas program having a positive approach is the Equal Opportunity in Engineering program. This is oriented toward an academic field in which representatives from racial minorities are even less well represented than in college programs in general. This program seeks "to insure that no qualified student, regardless of ethnic origin, be denied an engineering education because of financial need or prior educational disadvantage." The program has a special grant-in-aid fund contributed by a number of Texas corporations.

It may seem somewhat paradoxical that recruitment activities designed to increase the proportionate representation of the disadvantaged should be a serious concern of both public and private colleges at a time when other, more advantaged students are turning away from college or are graduating only to find that they sometimes cannot obtain jobs.

However, what may be unpleasant reality for advantaged students may be pleasant reality for disadvantaged students. Not only are colleges and universities under moral and political constraints to provide special opportunities for disadvantaged students, especially from racial minorities, but so are other institutions and organizations. Thus, black or brown-skinned college graduates may be in high demand in professional fields where there is a dearth of opportunities for whites. Rather ironically, in the field of student development itself, a black or brown young person with a master's degree has more opportunities than a white PhD with more experience. He also can expect about the same salary. This situation, of course, is reverse discrimination, but it also is reality.

Vestibule Programs, the Extended Freshman Year, and Related Procedures

It is unrealistic to expect disadvantaged students to function in a fully competitive fashion without extensive special assistance of various kinds. Two related patterns have been found to be most effective. The first is the vestibule program, a special program designed to assist disadvantaged students (called also transitional program, summer institute, etc.). For many disadvantaged students, considerable reorientation and remedial activity are necessary before there is any substantial involvement with the academic program. Vestibule programs can be scheduled for a summer or for spring, but for practical reasons they probably should begin in the fall because: (a) admissions processing may not be complete until late summer; (b) many such students need to earn money in the summer; and (c) many disadvantaged students consider humiliating and degrading the obvious identification that goes with being required to participate in such off-season activities. Those who recognize their need for such a program often feel that their involvement is less obvious when their activity off and on campus is seen as part of a program which includes regularly admitted students.

Not all, perhaps not even most, disadvantaged students need a "pure" vestibule program, i.e., a program which earns no credits or other indications of progress toward a degree. This is especially true if some credit can be given for certain aspects of the work which they must undertake. Credit for remedial work in basic academic skill areas such as mathematics and reading is sometimes hard to arrange in selective colleges. On the other hand, those activities which foster emotional growth, attitudinal change, and improved self-concepts often can be incorporated into academically acceptable formats such as human development and black studies courses.

The second program might be called the extended freshman year in which the work of what is normally the freshman year is likely to take much of the second year, too. It might be more accurate to term this a "more time than is traditional" program. A wealth of evidence has been compiled over the last thirty or more years concerning individual differences in academic background and rates of learning of college students. Similar research has shown that there are wide variations in the time needed for traditional students to finish academic programs. Yet, the myth persists that it is "normal" for students to complete a bachelor's degree in four years--no more and no less. In institutions where this is the general assumption upon which programs and policies are based, clear provision must be made to allow disadvantaged students more time. Given the probable need for non-credit remedial work, for special counseling, and for other time-consuming activities relating to adapting to a new and very different cultural environment, much of the extra time will be needed in the early part of the academic program. For many, the work of the traditional freshman year will not be completed until the end of a second, "extended" freshman year. Of course, the vestibule program blends into the extended year concept.

The critical concept involved in the vestibule and extended year programs is the provision of adequate time without undue pressure to earn credits or to achieve any set minimum standards. This also should involve freedom from traditional but often highly inappropriate academic and administrative rules and regulations that were designed for other purposes and other times.

A consideration related to the concepts of the vestibule program and the extended year is that of academic rehabilitation. The customs of academia have traditionally been punitive, with the consequence that errors of the past are seldom really forgiven but must be compensated for by some kind of academic penance. Thus a student who attempts work in the wrong field or behaves with exceptional immaturity his freshman year, thereby earning many D and F grades, is required to balance the academic books subsequently with B and A grades. Seldom can he start over or have even the most inappropriate course work expunged from the record. Those from disadvantaged backgrounds who may be unsophisticated about what various programs require are among those most likely to make a false start or to falter during the early stages. Some colleges have recognized that such rigidity is not always good education and have made provision for forgiving such mistakes under conditions which protect the quality of the academic program.

Noteworthy examples of programs incorporating the concepts of the vestibule program and/or the extended freshmen year and of related procedures are the following:

1. Dutchess Community College of the State University of New York (Poughkeepsie, New York) has a Summer College Admissions Preparatory Program (SCAPP) and a corollary College Adaptor Program (CAP) during the academic year. Initiated in 1966, they are still considered experimental in nature and are limited to a relatively small number of students whose predicted chances for success in regular academic programs are poor.

   In the early part of the summer the focus is on individual assessment, individual and group counseling, and study skills. In the latter part of the summer session, the focus is split between remedial work in areas of greatest deficiency and work for academic credit to give the students a taste of what regular college work will be like. The academic year program provides continuing support of various kinds.

The evidence indicates that the program is especially valuable to "borderline" students, i.e., those for whom predictive devices indicated lack of success but who were just below the critical level.

It is concluded that the basic benefit of the summer program is giving the students a head start, hastening maturity, fostering positive attitudes and giving the students confidence including the emotional support of esprit de corps. Impact on academic deficiencies was not so obvious, nor did it seem to be a critical factor in determining who would succeed. Studies show that at least 50% of the students who take SCAPP graduate later from regular programs of the college.

A notable observation was that the "Hawthorne effect" seemed to be very important, i.e., the most helpful element was the factor of special attention and personal concern, not the content or nature of the assistance.

2. At Northeastern University (Boston, Massachusetts) a program for the disadvantaged began as a special summer institute that has been supplemented by an Extended Freshman Year Program. This is because the original program did not reduce to acceptable levels the attrition rate for such students, almost all black. Key stipulations of the new program are:

    a. Students that were identified in advance by the admissions office as being eligible for the special considerations of the Extended Year Program were permitted to drop up to one-half of the requirements of that year as the year advanced. All began with a full quota of courses.

    b. Provided they were able to receive credit in the remaining courses, they would then be permitted a second freshman year in which they could complete the remaining requirements.

    c. During this extended freshman year, they would be encouraged to take one sophomore course as a means of lightening the succeeding year's requirements.

The reported result of this program is a substantial decline in the overall attrition rate for disadvantaged students.

3. In each of the five undergraduate liberal arts colleges of Rutgers University (New Brunswick, New Jersey) there is a Department of Academic Foundations (also known as Special Programs) which provides developmental and supportive services to a special segment of the student body. This includes special personnel and programs to assist with problems of minority and urban youth. The program has the following major features.

    a. Applicants who may lack the usual college preparatory background are evaluated. Those whose non-academic leadership activities and motivation may predict a successful college career are admitted.

    b. Such students are invited to participate in a six-week pre-freshman orientation to college. Each student will have a chance to earn some advance credits, will work with the academic foundation staff to develop a profile of his strengths and weaknesses, and will be assigned a counselor who works with the student throughout his entire academic career.

    c. Each student is assessed individually and is helped to plan a course of studies geared to his own individual needs, style and pace.

    d. When necessary, the student will be tutored individually or in small groups. The student may also take one or more courses carefully designed to pick up a student where he is and carry him to wherever he needs to be to succeed academically.

    e. The goal is to enable every student with potential to realize that potential and to graduate, whether it is in four years or five.

4. Ferris State College (Big Rapids, Michigan) has been known for decades as "the school of the second chance." It not only has accepted students who have failed elsewhere but also has permitted students who have failed in one of its own programs to attempt another, more suitable program under certain circumstances.

Its redirection and re-evaluation policy permits a student to choose a new vocational-academic program following an evaluation of his aptitudes and interests and counseling by an educational counselor. Upon the counselor's recommendation the student is permitted to embark on his new program on a probationary basis. After he has been in the program a sufficient time to validate the appropriateness of the choice, course work taken under the previous program in which he did poorly (and which is not necessary to the new program) is deleted from his record insofar as meeting graduation requirements is concerned.

This policy insists upon good-quality performance in the new program but does not force students to compensate for past errors when doing so serves no conceivable educational purpose.

5. Northern Arizona University (Flagstaff, Arizona) has established a Grade Deletion policy designed to assist a student who has had academic difficulties to find a major more appropriate to his interests and abilities. This policy has the following stipulations:

    a. A student who has changed his major and has successfully completed a minimum of 12 credit hours in one semester in his new major with a grade average of C or better and without any grade of F has another chance. He may petition for deletion of D or F course work accumulated in his former major (major, minor, professional, or related courses). A maximum of 30 semester hours may be deleted.

    b. The choice of courses to delete is the responsibility of the student, with the recommendation of his new major advisor and the approval of the dean of the college or his representative.

    c. Initiation of such a petition is the responsibility of the student and must be accomplished not later than one full semester prior to intended graduation.

    d. Deleted courses will be left on transcripts but marked to indicate that hours and grades were not used in computing graduation requirements.

All of the above programs have two implicit assumptions. The first is that the most important consideration is whether the student is qualified and competent at the time he graduates, not at the time he enters. Defensible practices are those designed to educate the student, not to eliminate those who enter with correctable handicaps or who make poor initial program choices.

The second assumption is that educating the student to his full potential is of the essence and that time is not. Thus the four-year lock-step is discarded.

Modifying Values, Attitudes and Self-concepts

As was noted above, the single most critical factor in the development of disadvantaged students is usually rapid psychological reorientation. Attitudes and values that cannot be changed without loss of integrity and damage to one's self-concept must be separated from those that can and must be changed if the student is to succeed and enhance his self-concept.

For most disadvantaged whites, the problem is essentially learning how to adapt to work habits, customs and general behavior patterns of the social and professional classes to which they aspire, although they too sometimes may encounter emotional problems because of ethnic or social class identification.

For racial minorities, especially for the blacks, the problem is more complex. Only a few aspects of African culture persist in the black culture of the United States. Music is the most obvious example. Otherwise most of what is identified as black culture is a derivative of the general "bottom of the ladder" socioeconomic status. For example, much of the "soul food," such as "chitlins and greens," that blacks in some colleges have insisted be served in cafeterias consists of food developed in slavery days out of materials considered not fit for white people. Other derivatives from this low status show up in behavioral patterns. Even blacks recognize the existence of the phenomenon of "black time" which connotes a very approximate notion relating to the keeping of appointments, derived from rural antecedents in which work time was determined by daylight and weather conditions rather than by the precise expectancies of an industrialized society. Many black youths are from families which for generations have had a "boss" tell them what to do and when to do it, and who seldom have gained either economic or social advantages from industriousness and effort. They may expect more external direction and supervision than they are likely to get and may resent as racist any criticism concerning lack of application or self-discipline. They also may tend to view another black as an Uncle Tom if he disciplines himself, keeps his appointments and completes other obligations on time, sacrifices immediate pleasures to attain more lasting success, and otherwise acts as a conforming academic "eager-beaver" with middle-class work habits and professional values.

Consequently, the attitudinal and behavioral changes necessary to function in the professional and other leadership roles to which blacks may *well aspire may be construed as denigrating the black culture and as* having racist connotations. Most basically, these have to do with self-discipline, with making and carrying out long-range objectives, and with taking responsibility for the consequences of one's behavior. Thus almost every disadvantaged black student faces what seems to be a choice between becoming "whitenized" and successful, or maintaining his own style as a black and accepting perpetual lower socioeconomic status. It sometimes takes more wisdom and maturity than many 18-year-olds possess to distinguish between attitudes and behavior that are logically related to productive effort and success, and attitudes and behavior which signify acceptance of and conformity to the concept that only WASP is really beautiful.

Mexican-Americans and American Indians are probably slightly better off in terms of having identifiable cultural characteristics not so completely derivative of a lower socioeconomic poverty syndrome. Yet this syndrome tends to dominate the cultural patterns of all three groups in food choices, work habits, attitudes toward authority figures, and in many other areas; however, the patterns differ in important ways from one minority group to another, as well as for sub-groups within a given racial grouping.

Any highly formalized program designed to educate these racial groups in what their attitudes, values, and self-concepts should be is almost automatically doomed to meet with hostility and to produce charges of institutional racism. Yet, somehow, these students must be induced to make some rather drastic changes to survive and to reach their objectives because certain new attitudes and behavior patterns are functionally (not ethnically) related to success.

How, then, can the necessary changes be facilitated without arousing hostility and without producing charges of racism? The generalized answer seems to be first to avoid direct confrontations on the issue until the individual has himself become concerned about some of the practical consequences. Second, when he does begin to seek solutions to this dilemma, the answers must either emerge rather indirectly from his own experience or be presented by someone whom he does not view as an oppressor and racist.

The means which can be utilized are very similar to those commonly used to assist regular students in their development. Obviously, counseling in its various forms is a very useful means for helping disadvantaged students adjust to the necessary demands of the institution for productive effort and efficiency without relinquishing their personal and ethnic integrity.

Two points should be made regarding counseling the disadvantaged, especially racial minorities. The first is that almost every nominated program considered both group counseling and individual counseling essential parts of any program for assisting disadvantaged students.

The second is that there is almost universal agreement that counselors should be, as much as possible, from the same background as the students to be counseled. In group situations which are likely to be multiracial, emotional support can be received from other group members of the student's own race, and the role of the professional is somewhat different from what it is in the individual counseling situation. In such situations, there seems to be less concern about the counselor's ethnic characteristics.

Few of these disadvantaged students would be attending college if they were basically inadequate or weak in terms of personal integration. They are more like hardy immigrants coming to a new and culturally different country. Their acculturation is best facilitated by someone who knows the hazards and problems from personal experience. Therefore, the special qualifications of their counselors are necessarily quite different from the qualifications required for those who counsel individuals from basically acculturated groups. The problems of the latter group are related to personality weaknesses or immaturity, not to lack of familiarity with what is necessary to survive and flourish in the college environment.

For disadvantaged students, remedial and tutorial programs are generally considered essential. This does not, however, make such programs appreciated or even accepted. Disadvantaged students, white, brown or black, tend to be "turned off" by these programs. The major problem is not learning how to perform tool skills such as mathematics, reading, and composition, or how to study, but rather why these things must be done. In many ways, the lack of these skills symbolizes all the humiliating, frustrating, essentially degrading happenings connected with past failures. In addition, these "Mickey Mouse" and "dumbbell" classes are all too often viewed as another example of the "white man's put-down." This raises real questions as to whether methods other than formal classes might provide better approaches. Laboratories, clinics, workshops, tutorial sessions and related facilities available if and when students are ready to use them seem to be the emerging pattern.

Although a few years ago there was considerable agitation for the creation of black studies departments, there appears today to be a divergence of opinion and practice concerning the most appropriate organizational pattern for such studies. Nonetheless, there is general agreement that blacks and other racial minorities must have ready access to factual information relating to the contributions and accomplishments of their respective races throughout American history and world history in general. This is essential to the development of a positive self-concept.

Another cluster of organized offerings especially designed to help disadvantaged students are those focusing upon a human development motif. These use various techniques to help disadvantaged students examine the impact of their background upon their values, attitudes, self-concept, work orientation, self-discipline, assumptions concerning others, etc. The emphasis is usually on self-discovery of what is counter-productive in their own background and on what might be better alternatives.

For campuses with significant numbers of students from racial minorities, special student organizations for each of these groups is now standard operating procedure. These organizations provide support and reinforcement to students concerning their own race by presenting in unequivocal terms a positive assertion of the importance and validity of their culture. This, in effect, serves notice that they have a right to a respected place in a multi-cultural society.

Although these student groups continue to insist upon being treated with respect and to demand recognition of the worth of their culture, the specific techniques and emphases of these organizations change in response to the needs of minority students represented by the organization on the specific campus as well as in response to shifts in attitudes of white students and educators. What were considered essential activities a couple of years ago are today sometimes considered not worth the time and effort. Thus several campuses have indicated that Black

Week activities are not likely to be repeated in the future because black student organizations no longer wish to focus their activities in this direction. It is not clear whether this technique has been ineffective in accomplishing its purpose or whether the purpose it was designed to accomplish has been basically achieved.

Following are some interesting approaches to modifying attitudes that have been found to be valuable:

1. St. Petersburg Junior College has a Total Opportunity Program for Students (TOPS) which utilizes a format that appears to be traditionally academic but which has a hidden agenda. It is a one-year program clearly and openly designed so that "any high school graduate who just got by can have a second chance, an opportunity that 'TOPS' anything available to young men and women in the area" (from St. Petersburg Junior College brochure entitled "TOPS, a Total Opportunity Program for Students"). It also includes topical material that encourages students to confront their own attitudes, values and self-concepts in a non-threatening fashion.

2. Friends World College (Huntington, New York) emphasizes experiential learning which avoids the utilization of remedial classes or tutorial situations because they represent a psychological rut of poor achievement. The program develops an awareness among these disadvantaged students that they are capable of performing tasks adequately but need additional academic tools to increase their efficiency.

   A mimeographed report by the coordinator for minority group students, designed primarily for internal use, states that "Friends World College's emphasis on experiential learning allows us to begin with the disadvantaged student where he is, not asking how much math he knows or how his reading and writing skills are. The emphasis is placed on the viability of the experience that the student brings to the college and how he might develop it. The learning process begins outside the classroom as the student is able to choose and becomes involved in an activity of his own interests. No written tests are required to determine 'passing' or 'failing'. It is the student who must decide how much he has added to his knowledge as a result of the experience. And even if he hasn't the necessary writing skills to record his experience in his journal, part of which must be in prose, as required, he may decide to record the experience on tape and have the tape transcribed, or he may embellish the journal with photographs or have a slide or film presentation, minimizing its prosaic content."

The report cites several successful examples of this approach. One student presented as a journal a collection of paintings with a minimum of prose. Another student chose a study project involving welfare families and played a major role in resettling these families in better housing. His performance was considered as part of his journal, reflecting his skill and development, in this case as a community organizer. A third student produced a ten-minute documentary film on the work of a drug addiction agency.

The basic concept is that by working as paraprofessionals in jobs normally held by more privileged people, the incentive for learning is measurably increased, and in the process, the students learn the requirements of the job and the tool skills necessary to perform efficiently and obtain promotional opportunities.

3. The University of Texas at Austin has a program of Ethnic Student Services designed primarily to serve the needs of blacks and Mexican-Americans. What is striking about this program is the evident focus on group cohesion.

   Staff members in Ethnic Student Services, which is a part of the Dean of Students Office, have worked with organizational representatives from the Black Students and the MAYO-UT, the Mexican-American group. They have produced complete student directories of every student enrolled at the University of Texas belonging to those minority groups. The Black Students have a special calendar of events prepared by the Afro-American Cultural Committee. In addition, there is a "Black Survival Handbook" which lists black faculty and staff, and programs of the university especially useful to blacks. There are pertinent suggestions as to specific persons to see and what approaches to take to obtain the best service. This handbook also lists the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of off-campus services useful to blacks, including beauty and barber shops, churches, and other facilities. Also included are quotations from black leaders as well as prose and poetry supporting black people.

4. A handbook published by Lafayette College (Easton, Pennsylvania) is entitled "Rapped in Black." Its stated purpose is to "inform prospective black freshmen about academic and social conditions at Lafayette." It describes the Association of Black Collegians, which is the black student organization, and lists the advances made by that organization. These include weekly rap sessions with white students, a program bringing younger blacks from the area to the college, Big Sister and Big Brother programs to help black freshmen, a Sickle Cell Anemia Campaign, and a Black Arts Festival.

   The handbook also identifies black student leaders and includes much information about the black experience at Lafayette.

Not a single approach for which any success was claimed suggested anything that connoted meek accommodation to the standard, traditional model of the successful, conforming college student. Instead, these are essentially mutual self-help programs that harness the hostility and aggressiveness of minority students in a constructive way. The critical factor is the high motivation to succeed while retaining integrity. The minority students' demand for recognition also may be in part a method of assuring each other that they will remain black, or brown, all the way through, even though they are changing basic values, attitudes, and self-concepts in order to succeed.

Comprehensive Programs

What constitutes a comprehensive program is a matter of judgment. For our purposes, we shall define a comprehensive program as one that includes consideration of all essential elements of a sound program for the disadvantaged and combines them in a fashion that seems logical and sensible for the given college or university. In addition, a comprehensive program is one that seems to have enough staff, resources, and administrative support to perform the tasks required.

There appears to be some difference of opinion and practice concerning whether programs for the disadvantaged, especially for racial minorities, should be separated from student development programs. Wilkinson (1970) advocated separate student personnel services to focus entirely on the needs of disadvantaged students. But the dominant pattern is to make special provisions for minority students (not all of whom are disadvantaged) and for disadvantaged students (not all of whom are from racial minorities) within the broader student development context.

The exemplary programs described below are cited because all major components and considerations seem to fit together to produce strong programs capable of providing real help to disadvantaged students in any area.

1. Michigan State University (East Lansing, Michigan) is a nationally recognized leader in terms of expertise in student personnel work and student development. As might be expected, it has an exceedingly well-developed system for providing student development assistance to any student it accepts. It is particularly notable for the way it has responded to the special needs of black students, who actually constitute a very small minority of the university's enrollment. In essence, in every significant program, office, or situation in which a black student may need help, there is help available from a black member of the university staff.

   Before the student gets to the university he is contacted by peer-counselors. When he arrives on campus, he is welcomed by a Black Student Orientation Program conducted by the Office of Black Affairs in conjunction with the black faculty administrator. That office acts both as a basic contact point and as a coordinative and referral agency to specialized personnel located in each of the student personnel offices. It also facilitates various social and cultural programs for black students.

   Although there are black staff members in all major student personnel offices who devote much of their time and effort to the special needs of blacks, one of these special efforts deserves additional comment. This is the Multi-Ethnic Counseling Center Alliance (MECCA) which is a branch of the Counseling Center. This program is composed of many activities, including open-door, drop-in type rap sessions, a wide variety of outreach activities in residence halls, working with special groups such as black athletes, training peer-counselors, and assisting special interest groups. It involves itself very deeply in the survival efforts of black students at all levels of university participation.

Another unique feature of the Michigan State University program is the presence of one black student assistant in each residence hall, in addition to the regular student assistants who are responsible for a given subdivision of the hall such as a floor.

Various schools in the university support programs to encourage greater minority participation, such as:

School of Social Work - Association of Black Social Work Students

School of Engineering - Black Students of Engineering

School of Criminal Justice - Minority Pre-Law Association

School of Medicine - Black Pre-Medical Association

School of H.P.E.R. - Coalition of Black Athletes

School of Journalism - Grapevine Journal

Urban Affairs - Black Arts Company - Black Modern Dance Group

Somewhat unusual among programs of special service to the disadvantaged is the Office of Human Relations. This is the agency responsible for investigating complaints and for enforcing the antidiscrimination policies and procedures of the university. It serves not only students but also any person employed by the university.

Michigan State University also has a Developmental Program and Center for Supportive Services designed to provide special educational services to disadvantaged minority students. This is basically focused upon upgrading academic skills.

2. New Mexico State University (Las Cruces, New Mexico) has developed an integrated and comprehensive program designed to provide a multidimensional approach to the problems their ethnic students encounter. The program has the somewhat misleading title of Ethnic Studies but is not simply an academic department; instead, it involves many activities in support of the three basic

groups who constitute the primary populations of the disadvantaged in New Mexico--blacks, Chicanos, and American Indians from the Navajo, Zuni, and Mescalero reservations.

Although the three groups share some common problems, other problems are unique to each ethnic group. There are, therefore, three Ethnic Studies coordinators. Though the activities and responsibilities of each program have a considerable degree of flexibility, each coordinator is responsible for:

a. Advising and counseling services for minority students

b. Developing tutoring services for minority students

c. Recruiting minority students within the State of New Mexico

d. Coordinating an academic program leading to majors and minors in ethnic studies, requiring work through existing departments in order to develop ethnic studies courses and, further, to develop courses within the office of the coordinators

e. Assisting minority students in finding employment

f. Coordinating the location of funds and financial aids for minority students

g. Developing programs, through the Extension Service and Continuing Education, which relate the university to the broader needs of the non-academic community

h. Developing and administering cultural centers which are related to the three minority groups on campus

i. Assisting the academic departments in finding and employing qualified professional and administrative personnel from minority groups

Evidence that this program is effective is suggested by the reduction in attrition rate among American Indian freshmen from 58% to 11% at the end of the first year of operation of the program.

This program has been much facilitated by a program of Special Services for Disadvantaged Students. This provides direct financial support and utilizes counselor-aides and tutors who are either upper classmen or graduate students selected, in most cases, because they were reared in the same environment as the students being served. A fallout is that these counselor-aides and tutors have developed into a leadership corps involved in student government and community projects. Many are now considering graduate or professional schools where previously they had no aspiration beyond the bachelor's degree.

3. Oklahoma State University (Stillwater, Oklahoma) has developed a Special Services Program to help students who have been admitted but who may not be able to obtain maximum benefit from their college experience because of inadequate high school preparation; socioeconomic or cultural background; visual, hearing or speech difficulties; or some other physical handicap. The incorporation of physical handicaps in defining the disadvantaged is a rather unusual aspect of this program and one well worth noting.

   The basic reason for the program is that admissions standards permit admission of students from the upper half of the student's high school graduating class. This means that students admitted from high schools having limited facilities and/or having heavy enrollments of disadvantaged students are not equipped to compete academically. Not surprisingly, many are black or Indian.

   The program has a coordinator, an advisory council and staff consultants. The heart of the program is a staff of twenty paraprofessionals who work with these students at a ratio of 15 to 1. These are upper-class students who live in the residence halls, participate in the College Work-Study Program, and are themselves usually from backgrounds similar to the disadvantaged freshman. They meet with their students at least once a week on a group basis, and also individually with each student, making case notes on problems and possible solutions. These paraprofessionals attend a meeting weekly with the coordinator and/or a professional counselor assigned to the program to discuss common problems and solutions.

Backing up the program are the entire facilities of Student Affairs as well as referral resources from other agencies in the university and in the larger community (e.g., the Bureau of Indian Affairs).

4. North Carolina University (Durham, North Carolina), a predominantly black university, utilizes a Freshman Seminar, a one-hour-per-week group session of 30 led by a counselor, in which a variety of topics, including values and attitudes, receive attention. Student Personnel Services also provides in-service training in human relations development each year, utilizing external specialists.

   The university also has an Academic Skills Center to work with a group of approximately 200 students who are admitted with low Scholastic Achievement Test scores and need special tutoring. A full-time staff of tutors and counselors work with the student, who carries a limited load until he has developed sufficiently to carry a full load.

5. Tuskegee Institute (Tuskegee, Alabama), which is also predominantly black, has a sophisticated set of student development programs for its regular students. On predominantly white campuses, there is often an assumption that almost all blacks are disadvantaged and need special programs, while on black campuses more differentiation is made. This is evident at Tuskegee, which has certain programs for its regular students that are both innovative and generally applicable in almost any college. Among its programs for disadvantaged students, the following are notable:

   a. Project Pride is a special services program funded by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist low-income lower division students and physically handicapped students in making adjustments to and progressing in college. This program employs counseling, tutoring, and many other special resources to give these students extra help.

   b. A Summer Enrichment Program is designed primarily for high school graduates who have met only minimum admission standards and for early entrants from the eleventh grades. It is aimed at assisting them to develop the intellectual abilities and perspectives necessary for successful and meaningful collegiate study.

c. An innovative nursing program called the Curriculum Modification and Enrichment Program is a five-year nursing degree program for high-risk students. In addition to carrying a 13-hour academic class load, the students are required to spend several additional hours each week in the reading laboratory and the Learning Resource Center receiving programmed instruction in key subjects.

All of the programs cited recognize that the democratization of higher education requires a high degree of sophistication concerning our multicultural society, and imagination and flexibility to formulate programs which will foster the educational development of nontraditional kinds of students.

In no instance are the programs and policies that are designed to assist disadvantaged students intended to downgrade the quality of the regular curricula or of other educational programs for regular students. Their general aim is to provide assistance which will compensate for disadvantages so that disadvantaged students can be brought into the educational mainstream at a time and with educational qualifications that will permit them to compete on a reasonably fair and equitable basis with regular students from more advantaged backgrounds. These programs may and often do challenge rigid requirements and aribtrary standards that long have been associated with traditional programs. These challenges (e.g., to culturally biased admissions criteria) often require a considerable increment in resources in terms of both money and professional effort. Where these are in short supply, the regular programs and perhaps the regular students of the college or university are likely to suffer to some degree.

Yet, what are better alternatives? A return to traditional patterns is neither morally justified nor politically possible. Further, it seems clear that, if there must be a choice, regular students who are drawn generally from advantaged backgrounds can tolerate a modicum of damage to their education better than can disadvantaged students who, because of accident of birth, have previously paid such a price.

The desirable alternative is to have no student reach college age whose educational needs have not been well met. Until that time has come, however, institutions of higher education can expect to be required to provide special programs such as those that have been noted.

Capsule Summary

Although programs for the disadvantaged were initially generated as a response to political pressure from blacks, the nature of the programs has tended to shift. Cultural bias in educational practices is increasingly recognized as deriving from the work orientations, verbal skills and similar academically-related advantages of middle and upper-class cultural conditioning than from racial or economic factors, *per se*. Therefore, programs for the disadvantaged are being directed more and more at *educational* disadvantage as differentiated from ethnic and economic factors.

To break what tends to be a self-perpetuating cycle of educational advantage or disadvantage as related to social class, four major clusters of new approaches have been developed:

1. Admissions policies have been modified. Most colleges today are either "open door" colleges, or have alternate criteria for the admission of students from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. The assumption of equal prior educational opportunity is no longer made.

2. Special efforts are being made to recruit students of the "new breed." These efforts usually include seeking out prospective students in places other than the high schools and obtaining the active help of leaders in the student's home community.

3. Compensatory education programs often include pre-college "vestibule" training, extra time to complete a curricular program, and special provisions to alleviate the impact of certain college regulations which have negative educational effect.

4. The growing recognition of the importance of attitudes, values, and self-concepts in the educational process has generated a number of efforts designed to facilitate appropriate changes in these attributes. These include, in addition to individual counseling, such programs as special seminars, experiential learning opportunities, and minority group organization activities.

The general result is a strong trend toward opening higher education to many more representatives from ethnic and economic groups which have been grossly underrepresented in higher education in the past.

IV. THE RETURN TO PERSONALIZATION

Several factors have stimulated efforts to meet the educational needs of students of all types in a more personal, less bureaucratic and professionalized fashion than has been common for some years. It seems likely that the disruptions of the 1960's have sensitized educators to the necessity to attend to affective as well as cognitive factors in the lives of students. Perhaps the impact of the "educational factory" upon the personal lives of faculty members has stirred some educators to find ways to become again more personally and usefully involved with students as people rather than simply as faces in a classroom. Undoubtedly, the demands by minority groups and the disadvantaged for educational programs with a strong element of personal attention have generated some interest and demand for similar treatment from other students, especially when needs are comparable.

Many regularly admitted students require special help to meet highly personal needs. To the boy from a small town, simply finding his way around a university several times larger than the town where he grew up can be a traumatic experience. To the commuter student from the ghetto who must pay a parking tax and hunt for a place to study, to be informed that most students study in their rooms provides no solution. The need for social and recreational activities by 35-year-old single women is not ordinarily met by typical student activities patterns designed for 18- to 25-year-old single students. The vocationally and academically oriented methods for providing "individualization" that rely heavily on mechanized and computerized processes to assist in mass education systems are inadequate to meet these needs. While such processing is necessary to some extent to deal with large numbers, the personal, human element tends to be shunted aside. Mass education is both an economic necessity and highly efficient in many circumstances. For many activities, it is the only feasible answer. For others, it is not suitable. The nature of the need or activity is what is important. As colleges have grown large it has become increasingly important to recognize and cope with these needs that require personal attention. Probably more important to most students than having an individual problem solved with professional efficiency is the need to be treated as a unique person and to find compatible people on the college staff, as well as among students, who recognize and value that unique personality, and with whom common interests can be shared.

The Use of Technology

Walz (1970) has pointed out that man does not need to lose his individuality nor does the system need to become impersonal just because technology becomes a major aspect of processes involved in dealing with student problems and needs (in this case those of counseling and student personnel programs). Yet, to avoid depersonalization, a considerable level of sophistication and careful integration of technological processes with those functions that can only be offered by humans is essential. Indeed, as Wallenfeldt (1971) has outlined, in an ideal situation, technological systems are necessary to provide the highest level of personalized service to all students.

To date, because of the historic focus upon the meritocratic concepts that viewed the role of the institution basically as a machine to turn 18-year-old freshmen into certified vocationally and intellectually competent professionals, the application of technology has focused almost exclusively upon making the machinery more efficient. Maximizing the occupancy of class slots, increasing the speed and precision of record-processing, and similar uses of technology have focused upon utilizing the facilities and resources of the institutions to obtain maximum credit-production for minimum cost. The main functions of student personnel have been to see that the student turns up on schedule for appropriate treatment by this production line, and if he falls off the line to assist in getting him back on the line if possible, or out of the factory if not.

Changes in Counseling Emphases

The major efforts to inject personalization into the educational process have been through counseling. However, colleges and universities are never going to provide enough formally trained counselors and psychologists to serve the needs of a major proportion of students, especially if the knowledge and skills of those individuals are used in the time-consuming therapy model which has been the standard pattern for at least three decades.

De-specialization

One of the most interesting and effective new approaches to counseling focuses on de-specialization. We have already cited the use of peer-counseling with disadvantaged students. Similar attempts to use more advanced students to assist new students have also been found worthwhile. We also have noted the impact an interested black non-psychologist can have in counseling black students.

Highly skilled specialists are necessary in all areas of counseling relating to developmental needs. They should take direct responsibility in severe and complex circumstances, serve as consultants and trainers of less professionally qualified people who do counseling and advising and also act as consultants to professors and administrators. To use this limited supply of highly skilled talent primarily in direct counseling is an inefficient use of skill. These people should be used to make the entire educational system more effective rather than devoting their time directly to rehabilitative and remedial efforts.

Outreach Activities

Outreach activities take the counselor out of his cubicle and into the mainstream of college life through direct action where the students are, or through consulting and other catalytic functions aimed at fostering student development in a variety of ways. As early as 1960, Salinger, Tollefson, and Hudson indicated how the counselor's skill and special knowledge were used in a catalytic way in one institution to accomplish some of what are now termed outreach activities. However, it was not until the late 1960's and early 1970's that sufficient attention was focused on this approach to stimulate a major shift in counseling center orientation. Morrill and his colleagues at Colorado State University have probably studied, elaborated, and developed this general concept more than any other similar group, although outreach functions are a stated part of the role in almost any respectable counseling center.

True outreach activities can assume many forms. Instead of maintaining the passive, peripheral role to which he traditionally has been assigned, it is now seen as legitimate and necessary to the well-being of students for the counselor to reach out and initiate and facilitate change. The counselor is likely to be more assertive, to focus more on developmental and preventive functions, and to address remedial and rehabilitative efforts less to the student and more to the institution and its policies and procedures, as well as to the functioning of its faculty and administrators. In many outreach activities, the counselor acts as the student's advocate, whether in individual situations or in a behind-the-scene "class action," using skill and knowledge to bring about beneficial change.

Outreach activities should not be confused with decentralization in which the site of counseling is changed from the counseling center to some other location, with no change in the prevailing activity of individual or small group counseling based on a therapy model.

Counseling for Life-style

In addition to this basic redefinition of the counselor's role, there are more subtle changes in emphases related to counseling skills that reflect the philosophical shift away from the vocational-academic emphasis. Whereas much of professional counseling time previously was devoted to concerns directly related to vocational-academic progress, such as vocational choice, or upon emotional and academic rehabilitation and remediation, new approaches are likely to begin with the problem of helping the student determine his basic life-style. Defining a person, or his worth, by his occupational tag is apparently being replaced by defining a person in terms of his life-style, of which his vocation ought to be a functionally related part. Such a focus on total life-style also permits and fosters development of skills and the exploration of areas of interest not previously considered appropriate to either the in- or out-of-class educative functions of the institution, including some that are not only unconventional but perhaps even anti-establishment in their orientation.

Serving the Atypical Student

New approaches to personalization also focus attention on student groups that have received little attention in the past. Colleges have traditionally been oriented to the 18-to-22-year-old white male who is a good student, physically and mentally healthy, socially skilled, and resides on campus. All others--commuters, women, older people, minority groups, those with modest physical problems as well as those with some severe physical handicaps, the socially inept, and other atypical students who cumulatively constitute the majority of students--have had to adapt to collegiate programs designed for the typical college student. Yet, logically, the preponderance of help now should go to students for whom the system was not designed, so that the kind of special attention which has been lavished on the typical college student also is given to the women students, the "barbarians" (i.e., those who are not members of "Greek" fraternities or sororities), the commuter students, the older students, and, of course, to the non-Caucasian students.

Some innovative approaches indicate a redirection of attention to meet the personal needs of these students. There are also organizational restructurings which do some violence to the chain-of-command concept of administration. Similarly, some new organizational arrangements do not conform to traditional professional notions of what constitutes a proper physical setting or administrative plan but seem to have functional utility in meeting student needs.

Given the fact that community colleges have been established to serve students who are frequently atypical in some way, it is not surprising that they should be in the forefront among colleges that have developed techniques and approaches to meet the special needs of other than typical college students. O'Banion (1971) has amply documented the efforts of many community colleges to meet the needs of these students. Indeed, the many examples that are cited in his monograph on New Directions in Community College Student Personnel Programs must be considered as substantive collateral evidence to that specifically presented in this report. Although arranged in more traditional service-area categories, the examples cited are supportive of all the major trends in this report, and especially indicate a focus on personalization.

Some four-year colleges and universities are also making notable efforts to personalize their programs, often under conditions much more constricting than those existing on the typical community college campus with its predominantly student-oriented focus.

Some important efforts to facilitate personalization are the following:

1. The University of Minnesota (Minneapolis, Minnesota) has instituted a Campus Assistance Center which deals with problems covering every aspect of "communiversity" life. It integrates such functions as crisis intervention, student advocate, change agent, catalyst, informational resource, and referral agency. Its responses to these problems are immediate, individualized and usually effective. Its purposes are:

    a. To serve as a point of entry into university procedures for any student who has a problem or concern

    b. To serve as a facilitating agency in obtaining consideration of individual student problems or concerns

    c. To serve as a catalyst in helping students solve their own problems

    The Campus Assistance Center takes the position that it is unrealistic to expect an undergraduate student to know all the appropriate services available to meet his needs. Consequently, the staff functions to provide direct assistance to students when they can and to refer students to special service agencies when such services are needed. The Center works with various colleges of the university to develop adequate grievance procedures. It reports to the Vice President for Student Affairs concerning problems that students frequently face. It functions as liaison with parents, faculty, staff, or others having a legitimate interest in the student.

In essence, its goal is to help students who need special consideration to receive a positive response from the bureaucracy of a large university.

2. At New Mexico State University (Las Cruces, New Mexico) a more limited Student Assistance Center has been established in the Student Union Building with office hours from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The purpose of this office is to provide assistance and information in a personalized manner. The general aim is to give immediate assistance whenever possible to problems of a transient nature or to refer the student to the appropriate facility. The office is staffed by counselors from the Counseling Center on a rotating basis. It maintains a register of students wanting to tutor. During the first term of its existence, it served an average of more than six students a day.

3. At Moraine Valley Community College in Illinois, 10 counselors work out of mini-offices near two student lounges for two to four hours each per week to deal with walk-in counseling clients. Logbook records indicate that an average of three to four students were seen each hour (Dockus, 1972).

4. A satellite counseling center was established by the University of California at Santa Barbara in a neighborhood primarily populated by university students and known to contain many students whose life-style and attitudes were characterized by alienation and sometimes aggressive hostility toward institutions viewed as representing the establishment.

   This counseling center now utilizes community members as staff, backed by regular counseling staff as consulting and referral resources. The Isla Vista Counseling Center and Human Relations Program has brought together various community groups through a program called Community Exchange. It also has conducted various workshops designed to foster greater cooperation among the students in the neighborhood, the university and the general community to better meet the needs of individuals and the more general social needs of the community.

5. The Division of Student Affairs at Colorado State University (Fort Collins, Colorado) has developed a model for a student paraprofessional program which has the following goals:

   a. Extension of the work of the professional by freeing him for more appropriate tasks.

b. Provision of services offered to students by their peers.

c. Allowing for regular, representative input into the system by students.

Paraprofessionals are employed in the University Counseling Center, Office of Student Relations, Housing Office, and Student Center. They are utilized in screening and referral, program development and implementation, and to a lesser degree, in research and evaluation. Paraprofessionals work both with programs already set up by professionals and with student-development programs. Examples in the former category include: implementation of taped desensitization programs for test and math anxiety, research regarding married students and student preferences in housing, and training of academic faculty in techniques of small group discussion. Paraprofessionals work as trainers and liaison persons with such student groups as the telephone crisis service (Road House), Drug Information Team, and Renter's Information (a joint Housing Office-student government service).

Evaluation indicates that the first goal, freeing the professional, has been met in all campus agencies in which paraprofessionals have been employed. The other goals have been met well in a number of agencies, and are being evaluated more carefully at the present time.

Positions are funded after review by a paraprofessional committee. The individual professional supervisor selects the paraprofessional for the position, and is responsible for his/her training and supervision. Core or general training is also provided by the program coordinator.

6. The University of South Florida Counseling Center for Human Development (Tampa, Florida) has utilized a Peer Management Project in which the behavior of students in such areas as academic improvement, social contact, weight control, class participation, assertive training, and control of smoking is "managed," or at least given positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior, by selected peers. A statement by John C. Welch III, a member of the staff of the Counseling Center of the University of South Florida, indicates that the project's effectiveness has been validated experimentally, with students in the program meeting with demonstrable success in their various efforts.

7. Stanford University (Stanford, California) has developed a multipurpose organization called The Bridge which originally functioned as a drop-in center for students with drug problems but has been expanded to offer emergency and ongoing one-to-one counseling, encounter groups, and meditation space. It also offers classes and workshops in massage, natural childbirth, V. W. repair, bread baking and recipe swapping, self-hypnosis, and almost any other type of activity in which people want to participate.

   The Bridge is staffed by two psychologists and a group of trained peer-counselors and is open 24 hours a day.

8. At Mount Royal College (Calgary, Alberta) a counseling model for student development has been designed to meet multiple needs of a heterogeneous student population. It is aimed at developing life-style plans for students. The services are centered around an initial contact for each student at the time he first enters the college. They also include the usual help in advisement, registration, academic assistance and subsequent supportive counseling, and also involve classroom participation by counselors and consultation with faculty.

   The program in Life-style Planning is based on the assumptions that most students do not really know who they are, that they have not really had the opportunity to explore their own needs or understand their drives. Consequently, questions regarding goals, objectives, vocational choice, etc., are premature. It is considered essential that every young person assume responsibility for his own education and life-style. By developing a responsible concept of a desirable life-style before he enters college, it is anticipated that the student will demand a relevant education. It is then possible (as well as necessary) to fit the college and its offerings to the student rather than the student to the college. It is also assumed that most young people do not need a degree, and that a degree, as an end in itself, is declining in value.

   Life-style Planning begins with the student writing ten statements beginning with "I am" to describe his real self as he sees himself, followed by ten beginning with "I wish I were" to outline his self-ideal. He then selects from course descriptions those courses that attract his interest or that he thinks will fulfill some felt need. He also lists twenty "activities of joy." When he has finished, his direction and plan of action may be obvious, but more likely he will need to discuss alternatives with the counselor.

The process not only provides the individual with insights into himself as a human being, but also puts him in a position to know what the institution must do to meet his requirements rather than fitting himself to the institution. He can order "a la carte" rather than choose from the limited alternatives on the standard menu.

9. The University of Texas has a program for men and women older than the typical college student. These people may or may not be disadvantaged in ethnic or socioeconomic terms, but they do tend to be disadvantaged in terms of confidence, of managing programs which are geared to the life-style of younger people, of coping with formal examinations, and of dealing with other aspects of a large higher education system. Therefore, they need special attention to personal needs of a quite different type from youthful students. In effect, the Continuing Education of Women and Men program (CEWM) acts as an interface between the older student and the university, providing counseling and information, clarifying procedures and regulations, and promoting effective utilization of university resources.

   This agency also works with two organizations of older students. The Association for Women's Active Return to Education (AWARE) is a student organization designed to encourage and assist individual mature women who are continuing their education on campus and to encourage other older women to return to the university.

   There is also a social group called Students Older Than Average (SOTA) whose activities include a monthly "sandwich seminar" featuring topics of special interest, and a bi-monthly Happy Hour.

10. The University of Maryland (College Park, Maryland) has reorganized its Student Affairs Division to give major status to its new Office of Commuter Affairs. The office develops special programs to serve commuters and acts as liaison to make units of the physical plant available to commuter students for study, rest, and other "between class" functions for which the resident student uses his room or hall. Similarly, the Student Development Office has initiated courses such as one on "The Monster," i.e., the care and maintenance of the automobile which is viewed as the student's "roommate" upon which he is very dependent.

11. Also at the University of Maryland, the Counseling Center has become part of a larger student development program, with the Director of the Counseling Center also serving as the Director of Student Health and Development, as well as Professor of Education

and Psychology. Student Health and Development now encompasses Health Services, Counseling Center, Career Development and Student Development. The Director's multiple roles and responsibilities permit him to coordinate and integrate some of the major functions of all these units, utilizing counselor trainees as paraprofessionals as well as efficiently using the talents of professional counselors and other specialists. As a result, the regular functions of the Counseling Center will become more closely meshed with orientation activities, life-style development and a variety of other functions. What is hoped will emerge is a cohesive and systematic program designed to serve a diverse range of students, especially those not previously well served by the university, such as the disadvantaged, minority students, and commuters.

12. At Herbert Lehman College (Bronx, New York) a "cluster counseling" arrangement is used in which each freshman student is advised by a staff member who is fundamentally a generalist, but who is also somewhat of a specialist in one or more areas (e.g., financial aids, study skills, etc.). Each cluster contains someone having special skills and knowledge in each of the more common areas in which such expertise might be necessary. Therefore, each counselor has ready access to consultants and is himself a consultant from time to time. Yet, counseling on any student problem is normally a one-on-one relationship, and the student maintains his relationship with his counselor over a sufficient period of time so that they get to know each other.

This relationship is reinforced and enhanced through colloquia in which each counselor meets weekly with groups of his counselees. The agenda is the responsibility of the counselor, but is usually quite open and likely to focus on topics such as the college bureaucracy and how to deal with it, study skills, self-actualization, how to minimize alienation, etc.

This approach was developed to provide necessary help to students, following the change from selective admissions to open admissions, and is generally viewed as working well, especially for the less academically sophisticated students accepted under the new policy.

One mildly negative reaction was that some of the more highly trained counselors were frustrated by having to cope with certain tasks not to their liking or in their area of specialization, such as determining the exact amount of financial aid a student should have.

Complementing these professional counselors are upperclass peer counselors designated as Counseling Assistants. Their function is to serve as role models for students admitted under the open admissions policy who have never known anyone who went to college, who have unusual difficulty meeting "successful" students on campus, or who are first-generation college students without adequate role models in the family. This role-model concept rests on the assumption that the new student can learn by imitation the behavioral patterns that are required to be successful in college.

The general approach rests on the ability of the college to identify the vast range of individual differences which an open admissions policy brings to the campus. Other supportive programs include tutoring, provisions for credit by examination, and similar programs based in the curriculum.

In essence, this college provides for all students who need personalized help the kind of comprehensive program often available on a systematic basis only to students designated as disadvantaged or members of racial minorities.

The above programs share a common focus upon humanizing and personalizing the contact between counseling staff member and student. This is done in a variety of ways--by insuring frequent contacts over a relatively long span of time; by reducing the status-gap between counselor and student; by insisting upon one-stop immediate service with results. Conversely, this focus upon personalization tends to break down departmental fences. It assumes that the institution can adapt to meet the students' needs rather than forcing the student to choose among ill-fitting alternatives. It takes professional skills to the student's natural "turf" rather than requiring him to penetrate the domain of the institutional bureaucracy. In addition, these approaches reflect a concern for more balanced treatment of students, resulting in a much broader range of services primarily to meet the nontraditional needs of atypical students.

Capsule Summary

The heterogeneity of students and sheer institutional size and complexity have fostered programs to meet a wide variety of individual needs in many aspects of students' lives. Except in academically related efforts, relatively little use has been made of computerized and other technological processes.

Major developments have included changes in counseling emphases involving more use of less highly professionalized personnel; a focus on outreach activities for fully qualified professionals; and a trend toward focusing on the student's total life-style rather than vocational choice, emotional adjustment or some other more narrow aspect. The needs of atypical students--commuters, older people, the handicapped, the social unskilled, and members of racial minorities--are receiving particular consideration.

V. INNOVATION IN THE CURRICULUM: COMPLEMENT TO STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Subject-matter specialists and administrators have traditionally referred to student personnel administrators, counselors and similar student development specialists as supportive and supplemental educational personnel. This has tended to foster the notion that student personnel specialists are second-class educators. Therefore, it is somewhat ironic that one of the major thrusts of new approaches is the supportive, supplemental role of the curriculum in relation to the student development emphasis on personalizing higher education. Many curricula now include courses related to human development, life-style planning, and similar topics that focus in a very personal way upon the developmental needs of the student.

Obviously, instructional services and student personnel services are complementary functions. The recognition that courses can be developed to complement counseling, and that counselors have much to contribute through outreach activities to modify and develop curricula has caused a flowering of reciprocity between the two groups of educators. In an increasing number of colleges, jurisdictional identification has ceased to be a useful concept. Teachers may work more than half time as advisers or counselors, and counseling specialists may find most of their time committed to classes and seminars.

This blurring of patterns is also characteristic of the second major thrust relating to curricula. This second thrust encompasses a wide variety of alternatives to standard curricula, including various types of independent study in which faculty members function mainly as advisers, and new curricular patterns that constitute the entire curriculum of the college or of a school within the university.

A third major thrust is perhaps the most indicative of the fundamental philosophical shift that is taking place. Instead of teaching students how to exploit natural resources, these courses teach students how to deal with those who do so too ruthlessly. Instead of teaching ROTC candidates how to wage war, these courses focus on waging peace. Instead of training budding politicians and public administrators, these courses teach students how to confront and cope with politicians and public administrators. Instead of focusing on earning a living, they focus on how to live and sometimes on preparation for death. In short, this third thrust seems to focus on converting the information available into forms which serve the student's personal purposes and goals, rather than focusing on converting the student into an instrument designed to serve the goals of society, especially when those goals are basically defined in vocational terms.

Some noteworthy examples illustrating one or more of these thrusts are the following:

1. El Centro Community College (Dallas, Texas) has a Guided Studies program for students who need to upgrade their educational development in the areas of composition, reading, mathematics, language usage and human relationships. The program is intensive and individualized so that students are able to progress at their own rate of speed. Criteria for enrolling in these basic courses are level of skill, test scores, and counselor recommendation.

   Although the above may seem little different from other remedial programs, the implementation has some unusual features. The initial focus is on the self-concept, with building of confidence the most important factor. Several weeks may be spent before the student attempts substantive remedial or corrective work.

   Another notable feature of the Guided Studies program is that it utilizes peer-counselors who were themselves successful in the Guided Studies program. Included is a recruitment program in which "street kids" without high school graduation are brought in and receive close attention by peer counselors who work with them wherever seems most appropriate, whether it be in the main lobby of the one large building complex in which the college is housed, in the registrar's office, the counseling center, the cafeteria, or any other place. This seemingly rather casual, informal approach may not fit the professional stereotype very well, but it has one outstanding virtue--it apparently works! These street kids, who are not accustomed to dealing with clearly identified professionals in their offices, find much less difficulty in bringing their problems to a slightly more mature friend in the familiar setting of a lounge.

   However, the administration of such a program is not always neat. Under these circumstances, staff cohesiveness and morale are of utmost importance. The fact that the program is highly effective is undoubtedly attributable to the unusually supportive and positive attitude that pervades the entire student development program.

2. El Centro College also offers a cluster of four Human Development Courses designed to facilitate intra- and inter- personal growth through class activities. They attempt to help students seek answers to many important human questions. They provide each student an opportunity to examine his own values, beliefs,

attitudes and abilities, and how these factors affect the quality of his relationship with others. Since all of these courses deal with vital, personal issues, group interaction within the class is necessary. Therefore, each class has a maximum of 15 students.

Course titles in this cluster are: Developing Learning and Study Skills, Basic Processes of Interpersonal Relations, Personal and Social Growth, and Developing Leadership Behavior. The instructional staff came from a variety of student personnel areas including the Counseling Center, Student Activities, and the Guided Studies program previously mentioned.

3. In 1971, the Division of Student Personnel Services at Rochester Institute of Technology (Rochester, New York) was renamed the Division of Student Affairs and Complementary Education, with a single administrator being both Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Complementary Education.

   Complementary Education is a multi-dimensional concept. Its purpose is to stimulate, coordinate and experiment with efforts leading to the enrichment of certain dimensions of the student's educational experience at RIT. It attempts to: (a) achieve institutional goals such as preparing students for the civic, aesthetic, personal, and social areas of life; helping the student understand the meaning and value of what he does as a reflective and sensitive human being; providing learning opportunities that feature the usefulness and implications of technology as they apply to human needs and resources; (b) meet educational and developmental needs and interests of students which are not currently being met; (c) define and emphasize the educational dimensions of non-curricular aspects of student life; (d) aid the technical and professional academic programs with supportive learning opportunities for students; (e) enhance the quality of the student's educational experience generally and his/her career preparation specifically; (f) foster the affective dimensions of student learning and development; and (g) enhance faculty and staff sensitivity to student needs and effectiveness in facilitating student development.

   The unique developmental education needs of the 750 deaf students in the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, which is an educational unit of RIT, constitute a special focus.

Although Complementary Education is still in a developmental status, curricula and programs are planned in the following areas:

a. Institutional Sensitization to Students - to inform and sensitize faculty and staff regarding student needs, interests, and the impact of the campus environment on the student's learning experience. A faculty/staff development program designed to enhance effectiveness in meeting student needs is projected.

b. Developmental Education - to develop an understanding of the nature and process of learning and to acquire the skills needed for academic success.

c. Affective Education - to learn about oneself with a focus on value and attitude development and career and educational goals.

d. Experimental Education - to test and apply classroom learning in out-of-class experiences in campus projects and in the community.

e. Exploratory and Experimental Programs - to provide credit and non-credit opportunities for non-traditional interdisciplinary courses that do not fall within existing curricula but are related to institutional goals. Programs would include contract learning arrangements, independent study and competency-based courses.

Faculty will participate in student affairs programs and teach students through personal interaction with them in out-of-class learning activities. Each year a small number of faculty will be released from a portion of their teaching duties to participate in Complementary Education programs.

Significant examples of functional integration of education processes are as follows: the unusual combination of administrative duties in both student personnel and instructional areas; the concern about teaching not only subject matter content and skills but also about how people relate to people; the concern about values and attitude development as well as vocational and intellectual progress; the concern about experimental learning out-of-class as well as more formal acquisition of knowledge in class, plus the utilization of interdisciplinary approaches.

The Complementary Education program will be coordinated and developed by a steering committee composed of three students; 10 faculty members, each representing a college of the Institute; and the Dean of Complementary Education.

4. Santa Fe Community College (Gainesville, Florida) requires all students to take a course called The Individual in a Changing Environment. This is a course in introspection, with the experience of the student serving as subject matter. The student examines his values, attitudes, beliefs, and abilities and has an opportunity to evaluate how these and other factors affect the quality of his relationships with others. In addition, he examines the social milieu as it relates to his development and hopefully broadens and deepens a developing philosophy of life.

   Though similar techniques have been used for a number of years in human relations training laboratories, the fact that the course is required and that the method is utilized with community college freshmen is an unusual combination.

   Students writ[illegible]tion papers indicating how they feel about some subject--anot[illegible]dent, the instructor, the class, home or other personal conc[illegible]n experience, etc. They have community service and dev[illegible]ment projects. They also make unsigned evaluations of the class from time to time. The course is very open-ended, with students essentially setting their own objectives and seeking their own goals.

   This course is taught by counselors and is closely related to the counseling program, with many students in these classes also utilizing individual counseling help.

5. Fulton-Montgomery Community College (Johnstown, New York) has a program of Human Development Instruction which is primarily the responsibility of the Division of Student Personnel although many other educators participate. The Counseling Center staff has the major direct responsibility. This instructional cluster includes:

   a. Seminar on College Life - Advisement Program. These are limited to 15 students and are led by a group leader-adviser. They begin with a 2-3 hour Personal Growth Microlab during the orientation period and meet once a week for nine weeks. There is no standard format, but the major goals are to provide informal contact so that the student and his adviser get to know each other as persons, not merely as roles; to provide a reference group of peers; and to strengthen the student's self-concept through increased awareness.

b. General Education Program. This is a one-year certificate program which includes (1) remedial courses in English, reading and mathematics; (2) a small group course entitled Personal Development designed to foster greater confidence and a sense of direction through examination of successes, analysis of personal strengths and clarification of goals; and (3) Educational and Vocational Exploration, a small group experience exploring the world of work.

c. Achievement Motivation Seminar. A three-week concentrated program aimed at giving students an opportunity to more fully develop their potential and achieve a more self-directed style of living.

d. The Art of Loving. A three-week concentrated course focusing on the topic of love from the perspectives of literature, the behavioral sciences, and direct experiential learning with the aim of increasing the capacity of students to give and receive love and develop deeper, more constructive relationships.

e. Human Relations and Group Dynamics. A course which utilizes both affective and cognitive approaches to develop skills and knowledge in the areas of Interpersonal Communication and Group Dynamics. Topics include: Theories of Interpersonal Behavior, Listening Skills, Confronting Skills, Observation of Group Process, Transactional Analysis and Encounter Groups.

f. Studies of the Person. A course designed to offer the student an opportunity to study his own development from several perspectives within the context of an on-going small group experience. This course is team-taught by counselors and selected members of the teaching faculty.

g. Supervised Community Service. This course enables students to receive academic credit for service in a variety of human service agencies. In addition to their work in the community, students meet regularly in small group sessions with a faculty member to synthesize the data developed in their community service experience.

6. Kendall College (Evanston, Illinois) has developed a Human Potential Seminar Model which endeavors to change the climate surrounding students by exposing them to the attitude that there might be something right with them, rather than just wrong with them. The purpose is to help each person discover what it is about himself that he likes, with the goals being self-determination, self-motivation, and an increase in self-confidence and regard for others.

   These are small group seminars and involve seven phases. The first is a personal unfoldment process in which each member shares with the others those experiences and people who he feels have contributed to his being the person he now is. This is not group therapy. Any events including joyous, happy experiences that have been significant are of interest. Through an empathetic recall process, there is an attempt to demonstrate to each person that he is of worth to persons in the group and has been listened to. This is followed by the achievement and satisfaction acknowledgement phase in which each person details his achievements and satisfactions and analyzes them in primary motivation. The third phase helps students become aware of how to achieve those things they want to achieve. The fourth phase focuses on personal values and their relationship to personal conflict and life style. The fifth phase is the strength acknowledgement phase in which the person cites all his personal strengths and invites the group to identify strengths they see in him as well as to indicate how he might use his strengths more fully. In the sixth phase the focus is on areas of latent potential the person may have. The final phase is long-range goal establishment in the context of one's desired life style.

   Follow-up evidence of the first group indicates that in the minds of the participating students, the Human Potential Seminars have been helpful in concrete ways. A research study completed across eight campuses using an experimental-control, pretest-posttest design yielded positive results along the lines of the stated goals of the process.

7. Loretto Heights College (Denver, Colorado) has developed a Freshman Core Program as an option for 25 students each semester. The

learning activity consists of core seminars, community involvement, creative work, tutorials, and wilderness experience. More specifically, these include:

a. Learning Seminar - These are weekly meetings of two hours to examine and experience various designs for learning, through discussing common readings, visiting other schools, and other activities.

b. Core Seminar - With 8 to 10 others, the student meets weekly to study one issue (e.g., the environmental crisis). He also works on a special project and presents his findings to the group.

c. Creative Experience - This is a chance to make something to be shared with others (e.g., pottery, a musical composition, or an item of apparel) and to reflect upon the impact on oneself of this creative experience.

d. Tutorial - This is a meeting with one other student and two team members to plan, evaluate, and integrate the learning experience.

Freshmen (male and female) in this program live together in one of the college dormitories, where they work out problems relating to group governance and activities. For two weeks in the early part of each semester, the entire group takes off for a wilderness experience of camping, hiking, climbing and environmental seminars.

The project is directed by a team of three faculty members, upperclassmen, and two freshmen.

This program has now been in operation for two semesters and it appears that it will continue as a viable option for entering freshmen. The strength of the program seems to be its capacity to help entering freshmen do more concrete planning about their educational goals and the means of best realizing these goals. There is a heavy concentration on experience and affective learning. Some of the students in the program see a weakness in terms of not enough cognitive involvement. The Freshman Core Program has attracted students who are already highly self-motivated, as well as students who have very little sense of direction and see the program as a way of getting some direction. The blending of the two styles has produced many frustrations for the faculty and the students themselves since the two groups have significantly different expectations of the program. This can be seen as a weakness or a strength depending upon how the problem gets resolved.

8. Manhattanville College (Purchase, New York) has incorporated what it calls Preceptorial and Portfolio features into its academic program. These are aimed at recognizing the human importance and individuality of the student as a person.

   The Preceptorial is designed to serve as a fundamental course for entering freshmen and as an introduction to the relatedness of various disciplines. It is intended to facilitate the student's awareness of the college and its resources, emphasize the development of academic skills and aid the student to evaluate his progress.

   The Preceptorial can be team-taught by two or more preceptors representing different disciplines, working with groups of no more than 12 students; or it can be individually taught, with the topic being either in a single discipline or interdisciplinary. A sample topic might center around developments in Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, with focus upon a wide variety of disciplines and topics within that context.

   The Portfolio feature requires that each student present a portfolio to a Board of Academic Standards containing evidence of his achievement as a condition of being awarded the degree. This portfolio would include all grades, evidence of strength beyond the introductory level in two or more areas of study, evidence of an active attempt to relate the individual's special interest to a wider intellectual and human context (e.g., a film, a thesis, a research project, field work, etc.), and other data indicating quality of his performance.

   The use of the portfolio appears to be designed to allow more flexibility with less focus on grade-getting.

9. The University of Redlands (Redlands, California) has established, as an option, a Freshman Exploratory Studies program covering the first year, satisfying all general education requirements and offering a broad view of academic possibilities as well as in-depth experiences from a variety of disciplines.

   The program begins with a three-week condensed course including a series of lectures from representatives of 15 departments. At the same time the student participates in two seminars, one with an administrator and one with a faculty member, discussing contemporary issues in higher education.

Beginning in the fourth week he takes two of the following courses:

a. Disobedience and Democracy: An Introduction to Political Philosophy

b. Literary Expressions: Toward Human Survival

c. The Soviet Mind

d. The Power of Music

e. Contemporary Issues in Ecology

The second semester he takes two more of the above.

Other features of the program permit selection of a few courses from the general curriculum; a one-unit course in Contemporary Culture each term; a one-unit Counseling seminar each term, ultimately leading to the formulation of a graduation contract; and a one-unit involvement workshop in which the student selects three or four options from extracurricular activities such as political campaign involvement, interracial experiences, community service, interdenominational programs, or forensics. A Creativity Workshop offers choices in art, dance, drama, film, journalism, or writing. There is also an independent study requirement in the spring.

10. Pearson College of the University of Kansas (Lawrence, Kansas) has an Integrated Humanities Program which combines many of the humanities requirements of the College of Liberal Arts. The professors are frankly oriented toward a traditional or perennial view of life and education. The readings which form the basic content of the two-year program are almost entirely pre-modern, beginning with the Greeks, and continuing through Shakespeare, Voltaire, Freud and Marx.

The methodology includes requirements that no notes be taken in class, and that there be no analysis of texts, nor any library research. When the entire group of 150 meets for the twice-a-week assemblies, all three professors are usually present; normal modes of presentation are either a brief lecture by one professor followed by comments from the others or a cooperative discussion. Small groups meet once a week to discuss issues raised in lectures or readings, to study rhetoric, and to memorize poetry.

In essence, the purpose seems to be the rather old-fashioned one of seeking truth, not relevance, through comprehensive, searching intellectual involvement employing some unusual methods rather than through taking a miscellany of related courses.

11. Davis and Elkins College (Elkins, West Virginia) has developed an Alternative Futures Program having three basic options regarding curricular design:

    a. Diversified Program in which the work for the general education requirement constitutes about half the program and is spread among several academic areas.

    b. Integrated Program which is less predesigned and in which the general education requirement is met with courses designed to gather the insights of several fields around a single theme. About one-third of the courses are in required areas. Classroom studies are combined with field work in this country and abroad.

    c. Contract Program in which as much as 90% of the program is designed by the student in consultation with three faculty sponsors. The student must be able to explain how his goals are not met by either of the other programs. The program must include an area of concentration and special competence, and a broad, liberal learning experience.

12. The University of South Florida (Tampa, Florida) has three notable programs. The first is a Bachelor of Independent Studies Adult Degree Program which is based on a curriculum of interdisciplinary studies. The subject matter is divided into four areas: Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Humanities, and Inter-area Studies. Each area is comparable to one year of college-level work and is accomplished via guided independent study and a short-term intensive seminar on campus after the student has completed a comprehensive examination in the area.

    Applicants must be 25 years of age or older. There are no courses, classes, semesters, grades, or other traditional trappings. This is not a training program for vocational or technical purposes; its purpose is to provide certain broad understandings and the basis for sound judgments in the individual's personal and professional life resulting from the study of what is essentially a liberal arts curriculum.

The university also has an Off-Campus Term Program basically for upper division students. Up to 15 hours of credit may be earned. Normally, five of these credits are in a course entitled Community Interaction, an environmental studies course specifically designed for off-campus use. Other credits are earned through social action projects, independent study or research, international programs, work experience, or special projects. Students may extend their program for more than one term if they wish.

The University of South Florida also has a Leisure Studies Program that offers courses and seminars as well as lectures and conferences dedicated to the study of this increasingly important aspect of American life.

13. The University of Minnesota has a number of curricular options designed to provide flexibility and opportunity in unusual ways. The University College is composed entirely of a variety of non-traditional programs. Its long-established Inter-College Program requires each student to design and initiate a program of course work from more than one college, which becomes a contract when approved. Since all courses are drawn from other colleges, University College has no separate faculty and no fixed curriculum.

The University College offers an inter-college independent study program in which the student can accrue a maximum of 15 credits.

It provides an Experimental College program for students who wish to create their own program and participate in the governance of their own college. In this program, students participate in small seminars and may engage in directed study, classes in the Experimental College or elsewhere, or pursue other forms of learning as contracted for in the basic seminar.

The University College is also the administrative agency responsible for the University Without Walls (UWW) unit on the University of Minnesota campus. UWW abandons the notion that education must occur in a campus-defined atmosphere and provides education for students at work, at home, or wherever they may be. The program is aimed at the mature, self-directed person.

The Living-Learning Center, another unit of University College, has as one of its primary goals more educational involvement between university people and the community. The Center focuses on educational opportunities and in-service/learning projects outside the classroom. The Center also assists students, faculty and community people in developing experimental courses, institutes, field centers and other service/learning projects.

At its Duluth unit, the University College provides an opportunity for students to participate in a unique human services delivery unit through the Student's College. Examples are the Human Resources Bank, a personnel channeling service; and the free Univer-City, an adult education program for the community, largely student taught.

In the College of Liberal Arts of the University of Minnesota, several unusual programs also exist, including a Bachelor of Elected Studies Program which gives students wide latitude to prescribe their own programs. There is no major requirement and up to one-sixth of the credits may be drawn from courses not normally credited toward a College of Liberal Arts degree.

The College of Liberal Arts also has independent study programs including "Y registration" which permits a student to take a course without attending class; "X registration" which permits extra credit for more intensive study of a topic in the regular course or extension beyond the course to a closely related subject; credit by examination for almost every course in the College; and various kinds of directed work including directed studies, directed readings, directed research, directed instruction (helping teach a course which the student has completed) and interdepartmental-directed studies. The interdepartmental major, similar to the University College's Inter-College Program, is available within the Liberal Arts College, using the forty-odd departments of the College.

14. The University of Northern Colorado (Greeley, Colorado) has a new school, the School of Educational Change and Development, dedicated solely to innovation and change. Mature students have the opportunity to plan and direct their educational programs which may or may not culminate in a degree, although all degrees available in other colleges of the university also are given in this school. Students submit innovative proposals together with answers to a questionnaire and a graduation check list. All of these are reviewed

by an Advisory Board. The student utilizes a Resource Board of faculty members and also may use individuals as consultants who are not members of the UNC faculty.

In effect, the entire resources of the university are available to be utilized in any fashion that receives the approval of the Advisory Board.

15. The New College of the University of Alabama (University, Alabama) has a similar program, but with somewhat more structure. The unique feature of the New College is the totality of the package that has been put together. This package includes: the admission of the highly motivated and not just the intellectually elite, a concept of advising that deals with the total development of the individual, the use of the educational contract, the problem-focused approach to general education through interdisciplinary seminars, the use of the depth-study program involving more independent study, the recommended out-of-class learning experience for credit, and individualized evaluation procedures.

Each student chooses a Contract-Advising Committee to assist him/her in determining individual interests and choosing educational experiences most closely related to those interests. This committee is made up of a New College adviser, the student and a maximum of two other persons who may be members of the faculty, fellow students, or persons from outside the campus community.

The interdisciplinary seminars are offered in the social sciences, the humanities, and the physical and biological sciences. They are required of all students, provide some 20% of his educational experience, and foster a sense of community. These seminars are concerned with the great and urgent problems of the human condition, and are designed to help the student understand these problems and to be effective in relationship to them.

The usual depth-study program consists of from 8 to 12 courses. In the event that a student wishes to put together a depth-study program which does not fall within a traditional academic discipline, members of the New College Review Committee will work out the curriculum. Non-traditional approaches to interdisciplinary degree programs are encouraged.

Generally, the off-campus learning experiences are representatives of one of four broad categories: (1) cross-cultural (the student may spend a semester in a foreign country); (2) sub-cultural (the student may be primarily involved with a cultural group other than his own in this country); (3) formal employment (the student may work to test his vocational interests); and (4) independent study (the student may elect to work on a project away from campus primarily on his own).

Internship programs are also provided in administration of higher education, college teaching, and in local business, governmental and industrial agencies.

16. The United States International University (San Diego, California) has extensively developed the concept of the Middle College which is based on the generally accepted view that young people today mature earlier and are better informed than a generation ago. It recognizes the duplication between what is offered in the last two years of high school and the first two years of college. Therefore, the Middle College is designed for students 16 to 20 years of age who have completed the 10th grade. The focus is on liberal education with the assumption that specialization will come later.

    Because sheer size tends to mechanize and depersonalize a university education, USIU has developed a number of smaller campuses capitalizing on the more frequent contacts and face-to-face interaction that smallness makes possible. Campuses are located in Mexico, England, Africa, Hawaii, and other locations in the United States in order to facilitate human interaction on international and intercultural levels.

17. At the University of Texas, a course entitled Self and the Campus Society gives students an opportunity to study their own university. The goal is to enable students to learn about higher education in general and the University of Texas in particular, with emphasis placed upon self and the ways in which students, faculty, staff, and administrators relate themselves to the institutional structure. Four general areas are studied:

    a. The student (characteristics of both average and atypical students)

    b. The campus (setting, history, and nature)

    c. Organizational structures and decision-making

    d. Self-understanding

The course is open to any upper division student and utilizes a format in which a guest speaker makes a presentation with discussion following. Speakers usually include someone from the Board of Higher Education, the chancellor, the president, the vice-president, deans, popular innovative professors, and student leaders. On at least two occasions, a psychologist works with the group to help relate the individual to the institution.

This program seems of special interest because it allows the student to confront the institutional bureaucracy in a non-emotional setting. Issues about practices and procedures can be raised with key people as academic questions rather than as direct threats to authority and control or as possible efforts to secure special favors or exceptions to institutional rules and standards.

18. New England College (Henniker, New Hampshire) has two unusual programs.

In the freshman year, a number of options are available through sections within broad topical areas that reflect serious concern with current social issues. Section titles include Threats to Freedom; Responsibility; Alternative Reality; Reliable Knowledge; Religious Symbols in Judaism and Christianity; Violence, Aggression, Competition: Human Nature or Cultural Phenomena; The Creature Called Man; MAN BUILDS (and Builds and Builds and ...), and other topics having more conventional titles.

However, it should be noted that the courses are not conventional treatments dressed up in Madison Avenue titles. Topics clearly focus upon critical issues, and the reading lists are a compendium of much of the significant literature on issues of our day.

A second set of innovative offerings are the short courses and special projects available during the four-week January term. These include a wide variety of on- and off-campus programs, several in other sections of the country or overseas. Topics include: Adventures into the Mysteries of the "Occult" and the Supernatural; Carbonates, Diving and Lobster: The Florida Keys; Cultural Enrichment Program for Deprived Students II; Death Education as Preparation for Living II; Household Ecology; Jesus Christ; Study of Antiques II; A Study of Golf Courses; New England Churches; and numerous courses that combine study and travel to England, the Caribbean, California, Africa and other distant places.

19. Stanford University (Stanford, California) has two innovative curricular programs: the Student Center for Innovation in Research and Education (SCIRE), and the Stanford Workshops on Political and Social Issues (SWOPSI). Both provide an active mechanism for new credit-bearing courses to be introduced, usually on student initiative but also by faculty. The latter courses also provide ways of interacting with the surrounding community in many cases. The workshops offer topics such as: Fighting for Change in the Penal System; Rape in Palo Alto-Stanford Community; Development of a Playing/Learning Environment for Children; the Black Community and Stanford University; and other topics that approach highly sensitive or formerly "untouchable" topics.

20. Manhattan College (Bronx, New York) offers a program that clearly illustrates the kind of curricular offering that is antithetical to the dominant philosophy of higher education that prevailed a generation ago. It is a Peace Studies program which provides an interdisciplinary major including courses in biology, psychology, history, economics, government, literature, philosophy, and religious studies, as well as seven peace studies courses. It is expected that graduates will find employment opportunities in education, government service, business and community affairs in which their preparation can contribute to international, national, and community development; to international cooperation in minority affairs; and to efforts in other areas where their knowledge and orientation will make significant contributions to conflict resolution.

Although the programs described above are but a small sample indicative of a major new thrust in curricular development, the nature of the thrust strongly indicates that the curriculum is no longer limited to the narrow focus on the intellectual and vocational. In effect, we are seeing a reintegration of the educative functions so that educational administrative units and educators of all types are seen as having legitimate contributions to make toward educating students in all aspects of their lives. No type of educator is regarded as having special prerogatives or restrictions in terms of the method or locus in which he makes his contribution other than those established by the limits of his competence to do so.

In a rather curious fashion, colleges and universities have returned to a focus upon the whole student that has been absent since colonial days, but with the significant difference that the student today is regarded as a competent adult with potential to be developed, not as an incompetent child whose evil inclinations must be curbed.

Capsule Summary

Three major clusters of curricular opportunities indicate a trend toward utilizing the curriculum for student development in a way complementary to methods regarded as belonging to the student personnel category.

One cluster includes courses in human development, life-style planning and others that provide the student with insight and understanding concerning his own needs and development. A second cluster releases the student from typical curricular restraints, opening opportunities for independent study, experimental learning and similar atypical curricular patterns. The third cluster focuses on course content that previously had not been acceptable. Some courses deal with how to counter powerful, and frequently exploitive, segments of our society. Others focus on non-vocational individual educational needs. Still others deal with previously untouchable aspects of the human experience.

Thus the curriculum is expanding to include affective as well as cognitive learning. It is changing its methodology to focus less upon class hours and more upon real opportunities to learn. Most important, it is admitting to the curriculum content areas that serve the students' felt needs, not just those which serve the interests of other segments of society.

VI. THE SEARCH FOR A COMMUNITY CONCEPT

The majority of American college students today are being educated in super-large colleges and universities, each having tens of thousands of students. There seems to be some consensus that there is a direct relationship between the size of the institution and the degree of alienation and depersonalization experienced by the students. Many small colleges have used this apparent phenomenon as a marketing advantage. They back up their claims that the small college environment fosters superior education by pointing with pride to the high proportion of community leaders who attended small colleges as undergraduates. The key factor usually identified is that of close interpersonal relationship.

Yet any reasonably objective analysis of the resources of small colleges as a group in terms of library, classroom and laboratory equipment, qualifications of faculty, etc., is likely to disclose a number of shortcomings. Most colleges small enough to provide a high degree of informal personal interaction are likely to be less adequate in terms of the kinds of resources named above than are larger, more diversified, and more economically efficient institutions.

Despite the fact that the student actually may be receiving better academic training at the larger university, he often is not happy with his situation. He may feel that he is treated impersonally, not as a human being participating with other human beings whom he knows as friends, mentors, models, and colleagues. Despite the efforts of most large universities to break up large aggregations into smaller ones, these smaller aggregations tend to remain just that--aggregations, not communities.

Factors in Building a Sense of Community in Colleges

What, then, are the key factors essential to turning an aggregation of students, faculty, administrators, and other people who work in a college environment into a community?

Transcendent Values

One major factor seems to be what John Blackburn and his colleagues at the University of Denver have identified as "transcendent values" to which the majority of the aggregation can hold. The small private colleges, which often are denominationally affiliated or hold to some other clearly understood if not explicitly defined set of commonly accepted values, attract a group of students most of whom are dedicated to the transcendent values that pervade the campus.

Transcendent values may be defined as those values within a given group or community that have a preeminence or surpass all others for that group or community. Individuals may hold additional non-competing values or may vary in the degree of commitment to the core group of values. This commitment also has a temporal aspect. Thus, individuals may have transitory allegiances to higher priority values outside the specific college or fraternity community, or have more permanent feelings of commitment to, and community with, family clusters, religious affiliations, etc.

Transcendent values do not appear to constitute simply a single interest, such as skiing, the Republican party, a specific profession, an academic subject, or even a given religious affiliation, per se. Instead, they seem to represent an aggregate of interests and value commitments of a rather deep, personal and permanent nature. For example, most small denominational colleges have been committed not only to a given religious philosophy and practice but also to the cultural values that relate to the ethnic antecedents of the dominant group. They may be committed also to social service values; to the pedagogical and pastoral vocations; to a high regard for law, order, and social conformity; and to a host of other related values.

Yet the transcendent values of two neighboring Protestant colleges having apparantly similar doctrinal concepts are likely to be quite different. It is often difficult to identify such differences explicitly. They often are far more easily sensed than stated; they are nonetheless real.

Transcendent values are not necessarily related to religious commitments. Examples of sense of community also can be found in small public colleges having some unusual features; in private, high-quality secular technical institutes; and in certain departments, schools or other subdivisions in very large universities. Some colleges have as the dominant transcendent value a commitment to liberal political and social philosophy and action. Some college subdivisions, and indeed entire major institutions such as California Institute of Technology and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, have at the base of their transcendent values a devotion to science. The fraternity system has been built and has survived largely because of an implicit, if not clearly stated, commitment to certain social values and attitudes.

Part of the difficulty in identifying such transcendent values is that, like a coin, they always have two sides. If an individual is explicitly committed to a specific religion, he implicitly holds somewhat less favorable viewpoints toward all others. If the highest value is materialistic, commitment to humanistic values must have lower status. If certainty is very important, ambiguity is hard to tolerate. If ethnic superiority is a dearly held value, bigotry is also present. If aesthetic activities are most interesting, scientific interests have a lesser place. The more noble socially acceptable values in the group syndrome are often stated. The more ignoble but most critically important values are often hard to pin down, and even harder to get the group to admit. Despite the difficulty in defining transcendent values syndromes, they are commonly observable in all aspects of life.

Learning to Know Each Other

Small colleges, which may originally have manifested a highly coherent set of transcendent values, may see those values fractionate as the college grows and its interests diversify. Similarly, the cohesiveness of sub-groups within a large university tends to be eroded as the sub-groups get larger. This phenomenon suggests that a second important factor in building a sense of community has to do with frequency and intensity of contacts between people so that they can get to know each other at a level beyond simple identification. Even though an individual shares transcendent values with a majority of members of a class or living group, he cannot attain a sense of belonging to the group if he barely knows, or perhaps does not know, the names of other group members.

Peer Influence

Another major factor in building a sense of community is peer influence. It has been contended, in fact, that peer influence is perhaps the most powerful non-formal student development force on the campus and that its impact may surpass that of faculty and curriculum (Brown, 1972, p. 31). It represents, then, a potent resource which may be harnessed in the service of total student development.

Territoriality

Another factor in building a sense of community appears to be that of territoriality. We have already noted the importance of bringing services to the students' "turf," if one really wants to reach those students who have the greatest needs. For many students it is very difficult to invade professorial or administrative territory unless the proprietors of that territory have convinced students they are welcome.

There also appears to be a difference in the degree to which a particular student feels he has a personal claim on a given portion of student territory. He recognizes some places as those in which he shares an equal right with all students. Certain buildings or facilities often come to be regarded as those in which specific groups have priority. Finally, the student's room, or specific sections of it, are his alone.

Many practices on large campuses tend to take little or no account of this concern for territoriality. The broadening of the scope of the curriculum and the addition of a wide variety of students different from those for whom the collegiate system was originally designed has also created additional stresses and tensions.

The extent to which these major factors, and perhaps others, are taken into account and dealt with in a positive way has an important bearing on the degree to which the campus environment is facilitative of student development from a socio-psychological point of view. These considerations significantly influence the psychological readiness of students to function effectively in cognitive learning situations.

The search for community, then, is essentially a search for new approaches to student development which take these key factors into account.

Some Illustrations of Community

A number of colleges and universities have adopted new approaches which represent a significant attempt to try to regain a sense of community.

Some examples are given below:

1. At the University of Denver (Denver, Colorado) two residence halls have been set up, each focusing on a philosophical category of knowledge as described by Phenix (1964) in his book Realms of Learning. The two philosophical categories on which the halls are modeled are the empirical and symbolic models. In implementing these models, students interested in the social, biological, and physical sciences, in engineering, business or math fit the empirical pattern. Those fitting the symbolic

pattern are in art, music, theater, speech, mass communications English, philosophy, religion and history.

Students assigned to each of these halls were volunteers who were aware of the basic focus that was to predominate. A number of students having majors other than those specified were accepted because they requested assignment to the hall.

A number of physical modifications were made in keeping with the philosophical model. Computer facilities as well as calculators and other equipment useful in carrying out empirical efforts are available in the empiric hall. Similarly, a Performing Media Center, a Visual Media Center, and an Audio Media Center are located in the symbolic hall. These centers have available for student use a small theatre, closed circuit radio station, film production area, VTR equipment, music and dance practice areas and a darkroom.

Traditional residence hall staffing arrangements have been modified to provide assistant directors and program assistants representing the various disciplines, rather than the usual student assistants, for each floor. Both halls are co-educational.

There appears to be meaningful evidence of the success of this arrangement in the form of grade averages, degree of student involvement in hall activities, and return for a second year of residence. There is also evidence in terms of involvement, such as pride, enthusiasm, and obvious interaction among students.

2. At the University of Kansas (Lawrence, Kansas) all freshmen and sophomores are assigned to one of five colleges based upon the living group in which they choose to live. The intent is to provide the advantages of a small academic community while preserving student access to the richness of resources of the multiversity. These colleges do not attempt to create a new type of organized living group but instead work with the residential systems already in existence: residence halls, scholarship halls, fraternities and sororities. In order to broaden the student's intellectual and social experiences, each college contains students living in all types of organized living groups as well as in off-campus housing.

   The administrative division of these small colleges is designed to facilitate student attendance at classes in which they will join more members of their living group than was the case prior to the establishment of the colleges. As was noted in a survey of the University of Kansas students, "Students in the typical classroom were a collection of competing strangers.... The spirit of the classroom was more like that of the marketplace than the academy. Its members were a mass of individuals rather than an integrated social group. Housing groups, on the other hand were socially significant units."

The student usually shares the same adviser as other members in his living group. This advising group also attends the same English class.

3. Pacific Lutheran University (Tacoma, Washington) also ties its advising program for freshmen to its living group situation. Each freshman adviser has about fifteen advisees living in the same residence unit to encourage the likelihood of informal contact. Since this university is of modest size, the probability of class interaction is probably much the same as that at the University of Kansas.

   As an added feature at Pacific Lutheran University, resident assistants work with advisers for students in their unit. This fosters better communications, facilitates referrals, and provides general liaison. It also serves to lessen the student's chances of getting into serious difficulties without the matter coming to the attention of someone in a position to help him.

4. Raymond College of the University of the Pacific (Stockton, California) generally is referred to as a cluster college but would probably be more accurately described as a satellite college. This conceptual differentiation is important. Cluster colleges, such as the Claremont Colleges group, have been with us for some time. Their advantages accrue from pooling their resources to obtain the use of certain expensive common facilities while maintaining their independence and autonomy as small colleges.

   By contrast, a satellite college such as Raymond is specifically set up by a larger university to implement a special commitment--in this case to serve two kinds of students not well served in the regular and generally more traditional program of a functioning university. The first group are those who feel a need for personal and intellectual maturation before embarking upon their objectives. The second are those who wish to explore a variety of fields and subjects before choosing an area of graduate education or an occupation.

Excerpts from a self-study report best indicate key philosophical concepts and practical methods used to meet the needs of these students:

> Raymond College, then, is a learning college in the fundamental sense of that concept. The emphasis is on the growth of the individual student as a mature person. Such growth can occur only through a cooperative effort, and the College therefore is a truly mutual enterprise. Students participate not only as learners, but also as designers of that which they learn and of the methods employed in that learning process. In short, the students' involvement in the affairs of Raymond College is seen not just as a symbol of student government and self-determination. It is a commitment by students which encourages them to make the most of their precious investment of time and money in their education.
>
> Such an approach to education requires a very adaptive curriculum rather than a carefully structured one. While a structured program gives students the prerequisites to the attainment of a known objective, structure becomes a hindrance rather than a help when the objective is undefined until somewhat later in a student's educational career.
>
> The Raymond curriculum is subtly defined so as to delimit the total area of endeavor for the students. However, that area is broad, bounded only by the individual and combined capabilities of the faculty. Yet, even here, through the device of cross-enrollment in the other colleges of the University, students have at their disposal the total range of talents and specializations available on the campus.
>
> So wide a selection could confuse and bewilder students, except for a careful and attentive academic counseling system. Students will be advised from the onset of their freshman year, about the kinds of courses most suited to their respective stages of development, but no one will be coerced to take specific courses.
>
> Such counseling requires a close relationship between students and faculty. In fact, the closeness of that relationship is the basis for the success of the Raymond program. In a real sense, faculty must see students as younger colleagues to whom teachers serve as guides and

> mentors. Out of that relationship, rather than from mere ideological devotion to quality education, arises the excellence of the efforts expected of students as well as of faculty.

There are other unusual features and options. Freshmen may do all their work in the program Exploration and Inquiry, which is more informally called study in the "embryo." This program assumes that introductory college work must closely parallel students' general emotional growth and intellectual development. Seniors may conduct group inquiries instructing freshmen for independent study credit.

In general, the limited size of the student group (about 250 students), the close interaction of faculty with students, and the flexibility of the program, which include options for work in the larger university, suggest an atmosphere highly conducive to a strong sense of community--this, despite the fact that a number of students live off campus and no faculty live on campus.

5. Centennial College of the University of Nebraska (Lincoln, Nebraska) is an attempt to establish a college within a major university with the specific purpose of creating a living-learning environment that would foster both the intellectual and personal growth of students (Brown, 1972). This college was established in a remodeled residence hall with separate wings for men and women on the second floor but with classrooms, lounges, recreational facilities and faculty offices accessible to all on the first floor. About 200 students are involved. These were hand-picked from a pool of applicants. Certain core work is common to all student programs.

   The outcome of the first years of operation was generally positive in terms of a community concept, including many desirable results relating to student-faculty relations, student-student relations, and the general learning environment. There also were signs of problems that needed attention, such as too much strain on faculty members and some inadequacies of the core program.

   Whereas Centennial College seems to have approximated the living-learning environment which was its goal, it seems to have done so under what might be called "hot-house" conditions. The pool of applicants was self-selected and then the actual students were further selected, with the final group a distinctly "ideal student" type. The teaching staff was selected from the cream of the university teachers. The college was a special beneficiary of a speaker program not equally available to other university students. This favored status is counter to the trend for enhancing the development of all students, with any emphasis on favored treatment going to the disadvantaged, not the advantaged. Nonetheless, its general format and functioning incorporate several factors critical to the concept of community and its influence upon student development.

6. The Student Life Studies program at the University of Ottowa (Ottowa, Kansas) utilizes weekly meetings of small student groups. These meet with faculty and administrative members to gather data about the experiences that students are having and the impact of these experiences on students (Berte and Upshaw, 1971). Students are randomly chosen to participate in the groups, each involving seven to nine students. In early meetings, leaders focus upon establishing a climate of trust and openness. The focus of the group is upon obtaining information or perceptions from the students in discussions having a problem-solving, task-oriented approach rather than a "gripe-session" focus.

   From these suggestions and perceptions, reports are compiled which have resulted in actions ranging from simple rule and operational changes to major policy changes.

   A secondary result has been the development of a close relationship within these groups that has been viewed by many participants as equal in value to the opportunity to contribute to university change.

   The process appears to contribute in many ways to a heightened sense of community through improved communication, constructive and worthwhile involvement, increased sensitivity and awareness among all university segments. There is also a reduction of the psychological distance between individuals. The disadvantages of the program, on the other hand, seem mostly related to the mechanics of conducting sessions and of handling the data in a positive, constructive way.

7. At Oregon State University (Corvallis, Oregon) the Memorial Union is regarded not as a "student center" to serve only students. Neither is it an agency in which the interests of faculty and administration take precedence over student interests. Nor is it operated as a profit-making enterprise.

   Instead, it is regarded as a unit which serves educational functions not well served in the classroom. Its facilities and services are also accessible to all segments of the university community. It provides offices and other facilities for the student activities program and for student government, but these groups, *per se*, do not control or manage the Union. Similarly, faculty as individuals or groups use the facilities for various meetings, including academic functions such as doctoral oral examinations, but no scheduled classes are conducted in the Union under normal circumstances. There are business enterprises such as various food facilities and a bookstore, but the profits from these activities are fed back into various educational activities within the larger Union program. The basic body which establishes policy is a Board of Directors composed of representatives from all university segments--students, faculty, alumni, and administration. The president and vice president of the Memorial Union are both students. The president of the Associated Students is a member, providing an interlock with student government.

   The general thrust, then, is to serve the non-classroom educational purposes of all segments of the university community, focusing especially on facilitating a sense of community.

8. Claremont Men's College (Claremont, California), a member of the Claremont Colleges group previously mentioned, has taken what was formerly the on-campus home of the college president and converted it to a social center to be used by all segments of the college community. The Atheneum, as it has been designated, has been used by individuals and groups of students, faculty, administration and alumni as well as trustees and VIPs. The college president has used it to host "all-college" dinners involving 80 members of the faculty, staff, and students at one time. Faculty use it for informal seminars and classes. The Dean of Students' office has held meetings there for specific student groups. Student organizations often schedule special meetings in the facility.

Although the above may seem to provide much the same services as a college union, certain special features are of particular value:

a. It is a former home and has that feeling for people who use it

b. The director is an individual who apparently works well and harmoniously with all segments of the college

c. The food service provides high-quality family-style meals, avoiding the depersonalized cafeteria climate

d. The facilities restrict group meetings to a smaller size than are held elsewhere on campus, promoting friendly, open interaction

e. It is a special place where people seem to act differently, dress differently, and feel closer to one another. It is a retreat from the more impersonal campus.

A college union is regarded as the living room of a campus, but often the physical atmosphere and management convey an atmosphere more like that of a convention center. Apparently the Atheneum makes those who use it feel at home.

9. For several years, Lewis and Clark College (Portland, Oregon) has utilized a "peer group" living concept. Living groups of about 10 to 15 students form a relatively autonomous group responsible for their own freedoms and for living together harmoniously. Residence hall facilities have been either originally designed or modified so that each group has its living accommodations physically separated from those of other groups.

Also involved in the peer group concept is the Resident Assistant Program. Resident Assistants are trained as paraprofessionals in a three-term credited psychology course entitled Group Counseling. The course provides a full term of training and exposure in each of three areas: group dynamics, including leadership, communications and socio-emotional theory; counseling theory and practice which incorporates didactic theory presentations and a minimum of 12 hours of practicum; and resident assistant role expectations which provides an introduction to the more practical aspects of their duties.

The emphasis of the entire program is on the value of meaningful interaction with peers in a shared living situation. Resident assistants are basically directed to function as catalysts and counselors. Individual development, rather than rule-keeping, is paramount in the goals of the program.

10. De Paul University (Chicago, Illinois) uses an elective course, The University and Modern Society, to help students achieve insight into the functioning of a university.

    The content of the course provides a comprehensive framework for investigating the roles, functions, and issues that are critical factors in determining the nature and quality of the university. This description of content is used as a topical guide and stimulus for questions to various administrators and faculty members who are invited to sit in the "hot seat."

    The approach could be very informational, eliminating much of the mystery of a complex institution. It reveals administrators and faculty as human beings rather than as remote official functionaries. It is doubtful that the technique in itself fosters much affective change in sense of belonging. However, by providing information, it does eliminate some barriers to closer relationships.

11. The Davis and Elkins College Orientation in the Woods (Elkins, West Virginia) is well designed to assist in the development of a sense of community. The demands of a back-packing trip not only foster a cooperative attitude and an element of concern for others but also enhance the self-concepts and self-confidence of people who have not back-packed before. Even more important, students become aware of the environment of the college. Those from urban areas better understand how they are different from those of rural-mountain backgrounds. Students become aware of the possibilities for activities different from those they had previously known.

    After a day of such activities, campfire sessions explaining the college's program and options appear to be more effective and to convey more meaning that had previous classroom sessions.

12. The University of Northern Colorado (Greeley, Colorado) tries to foster a sense of community through a set of attitudes and practices rather than a specific program. The president is positively oriented toward the concept that student development programs and academic programs must be truly complementary. Orientation is implemented at the administrative level by a Vice President of Academic and Student Personnel Services, a somewhat unusual integrating of responsibilities. Next in line is a Dean of Students whose attitudes and interests as a psychologist foster a developmental rather than a controlling or managerial orientation among his staff. The staff includes people who, by choice and by assignment, devote a number of hours each week to confronting students more or less at random at various "turf" spots on campus to "rap" with them about their problems, needs, attitudes toward the university, perceptions of what the university could do to serve them better, etc.

Many students know administrative personnel and student personnel as individuals, and these staff members in turn know a surprising number of students as persons. Instead of students' feeling that they must cope with an impersonal administrative entity, they feel that there is someone in the system who listens. In addition, the feedback from students has alerted the system to the importance of a number of issues, has forestalled unpleasant confrontations and has generated changes in program emphasis.

13. El Centro Community College (Dallas, Texas) is a commuter college with the view that every student is a part of a community, that all have a vested interest in the programs and functions of the community and that all can share in decision-making processes. This philosophy is implemented through a town meeting based on the old New England direct democracy concept. This mass meeting is held monthly, is chaired by the president, and is an open forum for questions, problems, proposals and exchange of ideas. Although any aspect of institutional operation may be probed, fears that the open nature of the meeting would invite students to attack the institution have largely proved unwarranted.

There also is a Community Council, numerically dominated by student members, whose job is to advise the president, encourage existing action groups, create new groups as needed, and channel requests for information and/or action to the proper authority. The action groups are of two types: (a) permanent organizations which serve a necessary role in the College's educational function (e.g., the Center Activities Board) and the procedural needs of the community (e.g., the Judicial Board), and (b) ad hoc committees created to investigate, to propose, and to implement changes that the community thinks are important.

All of these groups can include members from every segment of the community: students, faculty, administrators, and classified staff.

14. A group of California State Universities and Colleges (Los Angeles, Long Beach, Northridge, and Dominguez Hills, California) have founded a program called Educational Participation in Communities (EPIC). This is based upon the premise that the concept of the college as a community does not stop at the physical limits of the campus.

    EPIC is an effective means for the college to share its skills with the community. Using the resources of faculty, students and professionals, student interns are trained to work in various community agencies with benefits to the community, the college, and the student. The cooperative efforts necessary to make a contribution to the larger community seem to foster a feeling of belonging and the development of a stronger sense of community on the campus, also.

All of these examples incorporate one or more of the factors important in fostering a sense of community. Seldom are any of the key factors involved in creating a concept of community explicitly stated. In fact, it is not always evident that those responsible for these programs are consciously aware of the fundamental factors underlying their efforts. But there is a consistency to the principle that these efforts are addressed to creating or enhancing a sense of community and by doing so have produced educational benefits.

Capsule Summary

Although other trends are perhaps more obvious and may therefore seem more important from a superficial view, the search for community is probably the most significant and key factor in terms of its potential for student development. Indeed, the ills that have stimulated the emergence of the other three major trends can all be viewed as resulting to a large extent from the lack of the kind of responsiveness and integration present in a real community. Lack of concern for student needs is present in the elitist concept that disregarded the needs of the disadvantaged; in the ignoring of the personal needs of students, especially the atypical student; and in constricting the curriculum to serve faculty interests and administrative convenience rather than the educational needs of students.

Critical factors in developing a sense of community have now been identified. Transcendent values, opportunities to learn to know others, peer influence, and territoriality are all important elements in developing a real community. Numerous programs implicitly or explicitly utilizing these factors are being developed. However, few institutions seem to be attempting to focus in a comprehensive fashion on fostering a community concept for all aspects of the institution.

VII. THE BRAVE NEW WORLD OF HIGHER EDUCATION: A SUMMARY AND SOME IMPLICATIONS

Many people have made observations in the last few years about the "radicalization" of college students and of higher education in general, but the essential elements of this radicalization have never been clearly delineated. There have been student demands for power and for increased participation in college governance. There have been student demonstrations against a number of policies and practices, some of which have been within the purview of institutional control and some of which have been beyond the capacities of the institution to change. These demands and demonstrations have been sufficiently widespread and vehement to indicate that something has been very unsatisfactory in the way higher education has responded to the needs of students.

The Emergence of Practical Answers

The frequent involvement of student personnel professionals in these confrontations raised critical questions concerning the foundations of the entire profession. Numerous analyses and position papers have been prepared in attempts to clarify and present alternative philosophical frameworks, organizational models, and training program patterns. Suggestions have been offered as to the appropriate status, roles, and functions of student personnel professionals. However, there has been a dearth of practical suggestions, presented in any formal sense, concerning how to "get there from here." Indeed, the leadership in the student personnel field seems either reluctant or unable to come to grips with the causative factors. Perhaps this is because they do not have a sufficiently sophisticated understanding of the real roots of the problems. Perhaps it is because they find it hazardous to challenge vested interests.

Fortunately, the development of practical solutions is not entirely dependent upon the prior development of philosophical and theoretical formulations and models. Neither does it depend entirely upon leadership in the upper levels of the academic or administrative hierarchy. Practical solutions are being obtained through an evolutionary process generated by specific programs developed to meet specific local problems.

It will be recalled that the three original target audiences for the present study were: (a) educators from racial minorities who had recently been drafted into the student development field; (b) educators from the white majority equally lacking in special preparation and experience; and (c) people experienced in student personnel work but in institutions which seemed likely to be particularly vulnerable to the impact of new kinds of students and drastic change.

Because the intent of this exploratory research was to seek out practical innovative programs which could be exploited in traditional institutions, it was not originally expected that more sophisticated student personnel administrators in leading institutions would become a target audience in other than a tangential fashion. Although it was hoped that educators outside specific student development areas might profit from the findings, they too were not primary target audiences.

It now seems clear that the emerging trends have important implications both for student personnel professionals generally and for college educators generally. When individual responses are collected and collated into trends and patterns, some very significant information is evident. The radicalization of higher education has brought about changes that are indeed "radical" in terms of getting at the root of the problems. There are important implications for what the emerging concerns of student personnel professionals are likely to be. There are also implications for substantial revisions in the role of professors. What then have been the root issues that have been at the heart of the demands for change on campus?

Based on the data from the present study it is possible not only to identify key trends but also to distill a series of principles underlying or motivating the reported innovations in student development programs. In the following paragraphs a number of such principles will be enumerated, followed by summary descriptions of the ways in which these principles have been implemented.

Change and the New Students

As we noted in Chapter III, the key constellation of new approaches had to do with the democratization of American higher education, designed to bring about a greater equality of opportunity for blacks, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, Puerto Ricans, and various white ethnic groups. These, plus other culturally or economically disadvantaged groups, such as youth from Appalachia, provide the challenge. In essence, this democratization process benefits people with potential who happen to be low in the ethnic and economic pecking order which pervades American society.

Principle #1. New students should be given opportunities to obtain higher education that include remedial and tutorial programs to compensate for their disadvantaged backgrounds. This principle also permits the disadvantaged to aspire to goals and standards of living comparable to those whose backgrounds have provided them with educational and economic advantage.

Implementation. Student personnel professionals have tended to accept this concept on a philosophical level but seem to regard these new students as special cases to be given special treatment. This treatment is intended to facilitate their adaptation to the "regular" system and assimilation by the system, as distinct from the philosophy that there is a continuum of students having varying needs. As products of the traditional system, it is seemingly difficult for many student personnel professionals to make the intellectual or emotional accommodation to a truly multi-cultural system, one which does not favor the educationally elite who also tend to be members of favored ethnic and economic classes.

Change and Traditional Students

In Chapter IV we dealt with efforts to personalize higher education. Some of these new programs were aimed at "typical college kids," and were intended to compensate for the loss of informal interactions which resulted from growth in student enrollments. These typical students are the young, white students from middle and upper-class families for whom special services and privileges have been traditional.

Many new programs, however, are being developed to meet the needs of students who are neither "typical college kids" nor the beneficiaries of programs for the disadvantaged, i.e., commuter students, older students, students with drug problems, students with weight problems and white ethnics from lower-middle socioeconomic strata. Other programs are being developed to meet new needs common to almost all students deriving from changed conditions of the college environment.

Principle #2. The principle underlying the trend toward greater personalization is that the provision of services is determined on the basis of educational need rather than upon an archaic notion of who a college student should be. At the root of this concept is the old student personnel point of view calling for "attention to the unique individuality of each student." The result is a strong trend in new approaches toward personalizing services for all students, but especially for those who deviate significantly from the college student stereotype.

Implementation. To implement this principle, counselors and other student personnel professionals are adopting more proactive roles, utilizing their skills more efficiently in outreach functions rather than rehabilitative functions. They are focusing on total life-style rather than on the more narrow vocational-academic aspects of a student's needs. Less professionally specialized, but less expensive and often more effective paraprofessionals are being used. There is considerable evidence of a new awareness of the importance of serving the needs of atypical students of all kinds as well as those of typical students. There is also evidence of efforts to personalize services to compensate for the loss of informal help caused by growth factors and other changes in the college environment which affect all students.

Changes and the Curriculum

New approaches reported in Chapter V are those relating to liberalizing the curriculum. These stem from two challenges. One is that previously noted concerning the image of the proper college student. The other challenges the traditional notion of what should be included in the curriculum. These approaches have based curriculum planning not so much on what faculty traditionalists have felt was appropriate for college students, or on what potential employers desired, but rather more on the basis of the felt needs and requests of actual students of all types.

Principle #3. The principle underlying the liberalization of the curriculum is that the definition of education as essentially limited to the intellectual-vocational activities of the classroom is not enough. A broader definition is required to include new types of curricular offerings, and recognition that both curricular and non-curricular educational activities are essential and complementary.

Implementation. Although there has been little sign of significant deletions of curricular offerings from traditional programs, there has been marked expansion into areas that do not focus on purely vocational or intellectual skill development. Some of the greatest departures have been those offerings that have posed an open or implied threat to some vested interest. Illustrations of new areas include: challenges to the requirement of ROTC programs, the establishment of ecology courses, the development of courses serving neither materialistic nor scholarly objectives, courses which are designed for creative or sensory pleasure, for coping with bureaucracy, for fighting exploitive business interests, and so forth. Some of these promise to be of substantial benefit to society as a whole.

Although student development specialists often have been treated as second-class faculty, and students have previously had little part in determining the nature of the curriculum, both students and student development specialists now seem to have an increasing impact on the determination of what should be included in the curriculum.

Changes and the College Community

On the surface, the main theme of Chapter VI, the concern for re-establishing a sense of community, might seem to stem less from challenges to traditional approaches than from problems of sheer institutional size. Yet the sources of concern lie to a large extent in the peculiar biases of the traditional meritocratic concept, and the solutions are essentially those that reject those biases. We have identified biases favoring middle- and upper-class cultural patterns with their WASPish aspects. But colleges now must reflect the fact that ours is a multi-cultural society. Colleges are no longer primarily for single males in the 17-22 age range, but for people of both sexes, a wide range of ages, and a variety of socioeconomic circumstances. Their purposes and interests in seeking a higher education go beyond the purely intellectual and vocational. Their transcendent values include viable alternatives to the WASP pattern.

Principle #4. The principle underlying the concern for re-establishing a sense of community is that every student should be assisted to identify and associate with a group or groups with whom he can share a sense of community, whether it be that of the numerically dominant group on campus or some other.

It appears desirable to develop interlocking and interacting sets of sub-communities which support and interact with each other in healthy, enriching ways for all concerned. The alternative is the depersonalization and alienation that beset a stranger among strangers.

Implementation. We have known for some time about such concepts as peer group influence, territoriality, the importance of learning to know each other, and, more recently, transcendent values, as well as important cultural differences. However, we have been relatively insensitive to the need to apply these, especially in out-of-class aspects of student life, and especially in innovative ways that take into account all of these factors.

Some significant experiments are underway which implement one or more of the important factors necessary to develop a sense of community. However, planned programs which implicitly or explicitly take into account all key factors and involve an entire educational institution are indeed difficult to identify.

Implications

Potentially, the combined impact of these innovations and the trends they seem to represent point to the evolution of a brave new world of higher education in which longstanding intellectual commitments to student development are actually implemented. Indeed, a comparison of the key aspects of the student personnel point of view and the four principles noted above reveals a remarkable degree of commonality.

It was noted earlier that our system of higher education has its roots in the feudal organizational structure of medieval times. This model has been buttressed periodically by additions to the structure that have contributed to its increasing rigidity and elitism.

This very inflexibility and inability to respond to imperative social needs apparently has created a crisis. The demise of "in loco parentis" and the demise of the concept of a class structure based on ethnic and economic factors have, in effect, eroded the foundations of the system. The imperative nature of student needs and demands resulting from the educational enfranchisement of new kinds of students, and the new adult role and concomitant powers and status of all students have made the question not one of whether the system will change to adapt to the new realities, but how and when.

The problems that must be dealt with are formidable. Brown (1972) in his monograph Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education--A Return to the Academy, has provided an exceedingly thorough and comprehensive analysis of the cognitive aspects of the current state of affairs which is essential reading for anyone contemplating making large-scale or system-wide changes. Indeed, it was an awareness of these concerns that stimulated the initiation of this study before Brown's monograph became available. Consequently, his monograph can be viewed as providing a frame of reference for this study.

Attitudinal Orientations

Although understanding of the cognitive aspects of the situation is essential, the real block has been failure to properly understand and cope with affective aspects of problems of restructuring higher education. This is evident in even the most recent and sophisticated efforts to deal with the basic problems of student development.

Brown's report reflects some degree of resistance or pessimism, which seems prevalent among many of the most sophisticated students of the general problem. First of all there is a vestige of traditionalism which is manifest in various concepts in his monograph. Essentially, there is a subtle but pervasive set which assumes that courses, classes, grades, general domination by the instructional and administrative hierarchy and similar characteristics of the ancient academy are inevitably to continue to dominate; or, if not, the alternative is to have faculty reduced to the status of employees and to have other lamentable consequences occur. Clearly, neither of these alternatives is desirable, but neither are they the only possible alternatives. They do reflect the dominant mental set of the majority of even the most sophisticated student personnel educators.

Brown is also apparently pessimistic with regard to the prospects for making major changes in the near future, especially in larger, university-type institutions. He seems to assume that only relatively minor changes can be made within such systems; or that, alternatively, systematic restructuring will necessarily have more negative than positive results not only for student development specialists but for instructional personnel as well as students. Indeed, "unemployment" (p. 41) is viewed as a distinct possibility for student development specialists.

Other educators and professional specialists also seem to have difficulty assuming an optimistic, constructive and practical stance. There is a tendency to arrive at common generalized philosophical conclusions, but conclusions which contain little of concrete substance in terms of practical solutions. This was evident in the task force on "Mental Health Services and the Changing University Community" of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education which resulted in a publication entitled Quality of Educational Life, Priorities for Today (1972). Most of the members of the task force (of which the Principal Investigator was a member) originally viewed their responsibility as that of designing better models of mental health services for higher education. A report focused on this service orientation might have provided a useful elaboration of traditional mental health service structures but would not have identified and dealt with the basic issues which contribute to mental health problems on campuses. However, as the task force probed more deeply into the causes of mental health problems, the need for modifying the basic educational systems became more evident. Originally, there was a rather prevalent assumption that the basic nature of the system was inviolate; ultimately, the inescapable conclusion and the thesis of the report were that the system had to be changed, that "Traditional service models and priorities will have to give way to new models and priorities that will have greater impact in the community and upon issues that affect the community's quality of life." (p. 13) However, the report does not go beyond making a general call for new priorities and new models for an "educational colony" which takes into account the new realities.

There are indications of increasing awareness and insight into the need for basic changes and role reorientation which include both practical and conceptual innovations. Wrenn (1973) has indicated that both philosophically and practically some counselors are increasingly sensitive to the new realities of our society and are taking steps to deal with both educational structures and new values orientations.

Yet, although counselors are in a peculiarly critical position to play sensitive and important roles, they represent only one aspect of the system. It is the system as a whole which must be restructured in a dynamic and realistic fashion.

This study has shown that at the grass roots level there are positive, practical things being done which cumulatively are inexorably changing the system. The question is whether to let the wheels grind with little conscious, intelligent direction, or to attempt actively and optimistically to provide direction of a creative type to avoid unnecessary dislocation and waste of both human and economic resources.

Practical Problems

There are some difficult practical problems to solve before the growth of concern for student development can be matched by accomplishments. There must be a reordering of institutional priorities and a realignment of power and authority. One of the things this implies is a change in the role of student development specialists. They must move into more dynamic roles in which they are recognized and accepted as competent educators with expertise in student development, as well as powerful advocates of student interests. Traditionally they have functioned either in rather limited and repressive roles focused upon controlling and managing students or in even more narrow, reactive and generally passive roles focused upon rehabilitating and adjusting students to meet the requirements of the institution. The emerging role is primarily that of facilitating institutional modification to meet students' needs and interests, and a professional orientation that is dynamic, assertive, and proactive.

Another implication of reordered priorities is a modification in the role of the instructional staff. A greater emphasis on student development means less focus on other interests. More power and freedom for students means a relinquishing or substantial sharing of control of educational policies and practice by instructional specialists, and at higher levels, by the college president and board of trustees (Wrenn, in Whitley, 1970, pp. 84-95). Ultimately, such sharing strikes at the heart of the feudal system of academic rank and privilege which places full professors at the top and freshmen at the bottom of an academic pecking order.

Still another implication of reordered priorities is a revision in the role of the "administrator" to more closely approximate the original derivation of the term, which is "to serve" rather than to control and manipulate students and faculty.

Give these threats to the status and power of the academic guilds as well as to the administrative hierarchy, and there is likely to be a long-range power struggle in many individual colleges and universities, as well as in the system of higher education in general, between the vested interests of those identified with traditional patterns and those whose interests lie with the emerging orientation. Forces both within the college and within its constituency will be included. Given the strength of the contending forces, it is to be expected that there will be victories and defeats, as well as casualties, on both sides.

There is little evidence that students will return to their conforming, dependent role of the past. It seems improbable that the feudal aspects of the relationships among the administrator, the instructional specialist, the student development specialist and the student will prevail.

More likely, there will emerge a new set of roles and relationships with authority and responsibility for various functions more realistically distributed. Task assignments will be related to ability and special competence, not to academic rank or administrative title.

This concept is very much in line with Toffler's (1970, pp. 124-151) concept of adhocracy as the new managerial methodology.

A Dream--or a Possibility?

It is hoped that what will evolve is a true community of scholars or colony of learners, in which all people in the community will be respected and valued in relationship to their ability to contribute to mutual goals and to fulfill their roles in the educational enterprise. Students would expect to be treated as respected junior scholars who have as mentors more senior scholars. This relationship might well be established on a temporary basis for specific educational purposes. Student development specialists would function as diagnosticians, counselors, and facilitators who assist the student by helping him to identify his educational needs. They also would help him to locate and involve himself in appropriate learning situations in both instructional and experiential settings including classrooms, his living arrangements, employment settings, and social, recreational and avocational activities. Administrators would function to serve the needs of all three groups of scholars---students, instructional specialists and student development specialists.

Indeed, it seems quite possible and practical to utilize the methods described in this study in a creative way which has neither the antiquated characteristics of the traditional academy nor the alienating characteristics of the educational factory in which students are treated like objects and educators are reduced to the status of assembly line employees. Instead, it seems both desirable and necessary to conceive of an institution of higher education (or of higher education in general) as a unique sociological ecosystem in which the roles and functions of each individual, program, or process are integrally related and complementary. As with any ecosystem, gross imbalance, lack of attention to realities, and exploitation by self-seeking vested interests can only lead to inevitable breakdown and disaster. Conversely, real understanding of the workings of the system, and appropriate procedures and controls to assure that the system works well only contribute to the good life for all.

Capsule Summary

Although the trends which have been described here tend to be in embryonic stages, they point to dramatic but evolutionary changes in higher education as it relates to students. What have been termed radical changes are actually changes to orientations highly consonant with the principles of the student personnel point of view, but often in conflict with the recently dominant but apparently waning meritocratic orientation of higher education.

Extrapolation of these trends can lead to a modernized, highly democratic concept of the college as a true colony of learners or community of scholars much different from the anachronistic and essentially feudal educational organizations which have prevailed. However, there is a need to change basic attitudinal orientations of student development specialists, instructional personnel, and administrators as well as the need to deal successfully with practical problems relating to educational priorities and the assignment of responsibility and authority. The new programs described in this report suggest that there are alternatives which require neither a return to a pattern largely dominated by the less desirable characteristics of the traditional patterns, nor acceptance of the educational factory syndrome. Instead, they suggest that proper restructuring can lead to the development of a healthy and productive educational ecosystem.

VIII. SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR FACILITATING THE EVOLUTION OF PROGRAMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOCUSED ON STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

In essence, each of the programs cited in the preceding chapters represents an attempt to remedy an institutional inadequacy. The fact that these efforts can be clustered into patterns or trends indicates that these kinds of inadequacies are endemic within the entire system of higher education of the United States.

In this chapter, an attempt will be made to outline a basic model of an improved institution of higher education. The suggested model assumes a focus of the institution upon a total concept of student educational development (not just an instructional or a vocational orientation). It also attempts to utilize practices previously cited as applicable methods of instrumentation.

Because many individual problems or problems afflicting certain groups are fundamentally generated by obsolete patterns of community structure, the first objective will be to suggest a more effective community model. Other suggestions will be outlined to support the basic concept, with the aim of developing an integrated design.

Man Is a Psychological Being

Theoreticians have contended that it is optimal from an educational point of view for students to associate closely with other students whose intellectual interests and basic life-styles and values are very different from their own. This concept of the educational advantages of student diversity should make a college residence hall a hotbed of intellectual ferment, with roommate debating vigorously with roommate, and with lounges, cafeterias and other gathering places resounding with stimulating intellectual interchange among students with very unlike interests and values. In practice what happens is essentially the same as what happens among the educational models (i.e., faculty) the students presumably are to emulate. In the faculty clubs or other places where faculty members of diverse backgrounds and interests gather from time to time, those who share similar interests and values systems seek each other out.

For entering students in a complex institution who are assigned more or less at random to a residence hall, or for commuter students, no ready-made group of compatible colleagues is available to join. Yet their need to find associates who share transcendent values is urgent, and their effort to do so is an elaborate ritual. What occurs is usually a kind of rummage sale free-for-all in which other students in proximity become "targets of opportunity" to be checked out. Many are quickly rejected as potential close associates. Some are put in a "possible" category. A relative few are tagged as highly promising. The result is that it may take a year or more for a student really to link up with a cluster of mutually supportive and accepting individuals. Until then, he is a stranger among strangers. Those whom he selects to be with as a primary group may or may not include his roommate. The group may include individuals from several floors or from other living situations. These become the people with whom he spends his time and who provide his links to activities. Some students, particularly commuter students, may never find a cluster of people with whom to identify.

The theory that maximum diversity is educationally desirable contradicts what appears to be a basic human need to establish a security base among like-minded individuals. From this base one can venture forth on one's own terms. This point is made to emphasize the need to work with human nature, not against it. What seems logically sound is not always psychologically sound, and man is essentially a psychological, not a logical being.

Creating a Real Educational Community

It was suggested earlier that large colleges and universities can be only a complex of smaller communities at best, much as a large city can be only a complex of neighborhoods under the most ideal conditions. The creation of such communities within a large college or university requires planning and careful implementation. Small colleges can facilitate and enhance natural advantages by applying similar procedures.

The Conditions Which Must Be Met

We have previously cited the importance of shared transcendent values, of opportunities for sufficiently frequent and intense contact to learn to know each other, of peer influence in learning, of the significance of territoriality. These all must be taken into full account in a sound community structure.

Another variable must be taken into consideration. Typically, the needs of beginning freshmen are considerably different from those of upper division and graduate students. Older students generally have much more clearly crystallized values and interests as well as defined clusters of students with whom to identify. Consequently, the pattern outlined below is designed to maximize the development of a sense of community *for entering students*. The system is founded upon a constellation of sub-communities from which bases students can grow and change to more advanced sub-communities serving different and evolving needs. The basic concept is to minimize the cultural shock and loss of identity which afflicts many entering students.

It must be unequivocally stated that the key variables characterizing these initial sub-communities and differentiating between them *cannot* be the kind of ethnic, economic, or religious variables which have implicitly been the basis for formulating most student sub-communities in the past. Instead, sub-communities probably should be formulated around differentiated conceptualizations of *life-styles*, with all alternatives utilized being socially desirable and contributing.

Building the System

To construct the matrix of sub-communities to create a sound and supportive educational environment for students in a large college or university, the following steps are suggested:

1. *"Outer ring" colleges*. Using the University of Kansas' Colleges within the College concept, divide all lower division students, or at least all freshmen, into colleges approximating in size those smaller colleges in which it is normal for all students to have a nodding acquaintance with each other. That size is certainly no more than 3000 and is probably more ideally in the vicinity of 1000 students.

   These "colleges within the college" can best be thought of as satellite colleges that serve as ports of entry for *all* beginning college students. Using a schematic concept, this is the outer ring of satellites. It is quite possible to have programs within this ring of colleges which extend to the bachelor's degree. This is the case at Raymond College of the University of the Pacific, which is a satellite college.

The United States International University is also an excellent example of the satellite college concept, although its satellites are dispersed all over the world. Recall that it has a number of colleges for students in the 16-20 age range, with more advanced educational options within the system.

For smaller liberal arts colleges and for most community colleges, the entire institution can be considered to have the characteristics of a college within the college.

2. "Inner ring" colleges. "Inner ring" colleges would mostly be professional schools but could also be upper division liberal arts colleges. In the case of large community colleges, they could be constellations of allied technical programs as well as more advanced programs for students who plan to transfer to four-year colleges.

3. "Houses." Distribute the students entering the outer ring "colleges within the college" into houses, each of which is characterized by an identifiable set of transcendent values related to life-style.

   What has been described above may appear to be simply a variation of the living-learning concept. It must be pointed out that in most living-learning centers, students are not intentionally placed in an atmosphere where they share similar transcendent values or life-style concepts with other students. The random or accidental nature of typical room assignment in such living-learning centers inhibits rather than facilitates the agglutination process that causes a group of individuals to meld into a community.

   Further, these houses are not to be thought of primarily as residential units with their attendant dormitory (i.e., sleeping place) connotations. Instead, it is the togetherness and active group involvement in enterprises of high common interest that characterize the house. Commuter students, apartment dwellers, married students, as well as single students living in various kinds of campus residence facilities could all be included in each of these houses. On the other hand, there is no reason that a building which has residential units as an integral part of the structure cannot be used as a base. Existing living-learning units should be easy to adapt to this pattern.

The bases for aggregation could be either those used at the University of Denver based on Phenix' conceptualization, or some other systematic life-style scheme. These clusterings probably should not be founded upon the overly vocationally oriented scheme that has been attempted in some colleges in some residence halls. Neither should there be the kind of clustering that was done at the University of Kansas which combined residence halls with fraternities, sororities, and other living arrangements. Unfortunately, such an arrangement continues to reinforce transcendent values systems with strong vestigial relationships to ethnic, economic and religious bias. To be sure, life-styles and transcendent values systems are somewhat related to ethnic, economic and religious factors. The critical issue is that each student must be permitted and encouraged to indicate what his or her preference or orientation is, and be placed in that sub-community on the basis of his own choice rather than the vote of others. It is particularly important that these houses be open to students from ethnic minorities and to the economically disadvantaged.

In many ways, Raymond College is a prototype of house organization because of its small size, focus on a specific set of transcendent values and intense interpersonal relationships among students and faculty. In effect, it is a one-house satellite college within a college.

There should be perhaps two to six houses in each satellite college. Experimentation is needed to determine optimum size of houses as well as maximum number of houses within such a college.

4. Transcendent Values Identification. Because of its broader scope, most students will probably be able to identify much more accurately the transcendent values with which they most basically identify than they are able to identify a truly appropriate major. Yet, there will be some who will be unsure and some who will make inappropriate choices. For these students, it is particularly important that a counseling program similar to the Mount Royal College Life-Style Planning model

be available. Alternatively, a seminar-type structure might be utilized such as the Kendall College Human Potential Seminar Model or some of the other human development programs which were previously noted.

Indeed, it might be well to develop a combined program in which students first clearly identify the transcendent values that dominate their lives, assess their potential in all aspects of their lives, develop a concept of desired life-style, and identify specific developmental needs. There are elements of these procedures in programs cited at Herbert Lehman College, El Centro College, Rochester Institute of Technology, Santa Fe Community College, Fulton-Montgomery Community College, and other institutions.

In addition to the common developmental needs that most students with adequate educational backgrounds would have, disadvantaged students would identify their own particular needs and problems including those of values reorientation, study skills, and needs in academic skills areas. For those groups who have been victims of racism and other brands of prejudicial treatment, not the least of their needs would be to find ways to cope with such bias and to enhance their own self-concepts.

5. Community Center. Provide a community center in which the house activities can take place. Although such facilities can be integrated with residential accommodations on many campuses, having a residential type campus is not essential. What is essential is for each house to have a community center which is defined as its exclusive territory and in which activities compatible with the group focus can take place. Such community centers can range from an initial allocation of some rather bare rooms to very elaborate and well-planned facilities.

From a philosophical viewpoint, these community centers should adopt the point of view of the Oregon State Memorial Union--they are to serve non-classroom educational purposes of all segments of the community, i.e., the house. Indeed, classroom space can also be provided through multipurpose rooms. Such a center is equally the territory of students, counselors, professors, and administrators associated with the house. These centers might well be thought of as mini-unions similar to the Atheneum at Claremont Men's College. They should definitely not be considered as belonging to students alone.

As long as basic control of such centers is vested in the house, there is no reason that they cannot also be considered as satellite unions served by a larger institutional union.

Peer-group living. For those houses which include residential facilities for all or part of their students, the peer-group living concept of Lewis and Clark College might well be used to foster an even more basic community group than the house. This program might be integrated with the adviser-living group pattern at Pacific Lutheran University to solidify the adviser-group relationship, with the peer-counselor assuming whatever liaison function is necessary.

7. House experiential learning projects. Within each house, it would be expected that various projects closely related to the dominant cluster of interests of the students and faculty would be undertaken, either emerging spontaneously from those interests or with a modest amount of stimulation and direction from the faculty, particularly early in the year.

Substantive involvement in such projects would result in learning experiences comparable to various experiential learning activities for which academic credit is given in traditional curricular patterns. Thus, each house can be viewed as an educational laboratory in which students learn by doing, with seminars, formal instruction, library assignments, activities involving use of technological equipment, such as computers, all organized, timed, and utilized in relation to the project.

Examples of such projects might be presenting a creative event in a "symbolic" house, or carrying out a complex statistical research project in an "empiric" house. Projects such as these have been undertaken at the University of Denver. If a house had a "social service" transcendent value orientation, projects might be undertaken with the social agencies in urban ghettos or among the rural poor, or with half-way houses or youth agencies.

In terms of evaluation for degree or credentialing purposes, provision could be made for a faculty board to authorize a certain amount of credit for a given student's efforts on a composite judgment basis. Alternatively, and probably more educationally desirable, the involvement of the student in the project would be part of a contract similar to that utilized at New College of the University of Alabama, or as part of a plan similar to either the Preceptorial or Portfolio program at Manhattanville College.

8. Formal class work. In addition to the informal experiential learning project, each house would expect to offer some formal courses, seminars, and workshops of varying duration. These would be related to the general focus of the house. Evaluations would be for the purpose of determining level of competency and additional educational needs, not primarily for grades. These should include vestibule and compensatory education programs for the educationally disadvantaged. However, within the experiential framework, there should be opportunities similar to those described at Friends World College to develop basic academic skills informally, or at least to have the need for such skills made very clear.

   Students might be expected to take some of their academic work outside their own house. At early stages some courses would probably be taken within the outer ring college of which the house is one segment. Such work might include courses which are either required of all students or frequently selected by many students in every house. These courses should be constructed to insure opportunities for stimulating controversy among people with diverse points of view. At later stages of their affiliation with the house, the students might take work which is basically associated with one of the inner ring colleges within the larger institution.

9. Special programs. Within each house it would be desirable to implement well-planned special programs designed to solve group problems, perhaps using some of the techniques and programs noted at Centennial College of the University of Nebraska, or in the Life Studies Program at Ottowa University. The opportunities for program elaboration within each house are boundless. There is probably an aspect of the law of diminishing returns relating to the investment of professional planning and effort. On the other hand, it is more probable that the common orientation of student personnel professionals toward viewing their role as one of stimulating student action and fostering new program plans to try to get more students creatively involved would be rather dramatically changed to trying to keep the ferment and action generated by students and their faculty advisers under reasonable control and within the limits of the resources available. At least, this is the implication of the fragmentary evidence available.

10. *Educators as models*. Those educators affiliated with a given house probably would find it very difficult and basically undesirable to maintain the kinds of formalized, highly structured and bureaucratically defined relationships that have tended to exist previously. Instead of being professors who basically "teach at" students, or counselors who advise or more non-directively and passively counsel students, or administrators who control and manage students, they probably would be cast more in the role of models and mentors. Instead of *teaching* drama or history or physics or psychology, the educator would *be* a skilled and experienced dramatist, historian, physicist or psychologist, working with students in projects related to his interests and profession.

    Similarly, student development specialists and administrators would be neither passive, uninvolved counselors nor dominating manipulators. Instead, they would be very much involved *facilitators* of individual student development and of community enterprises. In short, students, professors, counselors and administrators would truly *belong* to the community of the house.

    The pattern of faculty advisement at Pacific Lutheran University and at Raymond College, and Assistant Director and Program Assistant roles of hall personnel at the University of Denver all have elements of the desired student-faculty relationship.

11. *Office facilities*. The work of these faculty advisers would be facilitated by their having offices in the space assigned to the house. Perhaps the "cluster counseling" concept of Herbert Lehman College could be usefully applied; that is, within the community center of each house, the faculty offices of the professional staff should be located so that the specialized expertise and functions of each could be readily available to all.

12. *Paraprofessionals*. Working closely with these professional educators would be paraprofessionals of various kinds. These might well include both undergraduate peer counselors/tutors/resident assistants, or graduate student professionals in-training. Indeed, it soon would be evident that the difference between entering freshmen and distinguished senior educators would be one of being at different points in a continuum of development, not a matter of discrete categories designated by hierarchical rank. The relationships and functioning of professionals, paraprofessionals and the students in the various "peer" positions might well be modeled in part upon that at Colorado State University.

13. Community government. Within these basically self-governing communities, it would be perfectly possible to have the town meeting kind of community government used at El Centro Community College in Dallas. Representatives of each of these communities could then more truly represent group consensus in any institution-wide government body.

    It would be highly appropriate that teams of students, teaching faculty, and student development specialists from each subcommunity, both of the house and professional cluster type be on the basic internal policy-recommending body. This would supplant the faculty senates which often have focused too much on their own vested interests, and the "play pen" student governments. It would also give an effective voice to specialists in student development.

As was implied above, the house model either could constitute the primary community identification for the student throughout his collegiate career, or could be a relatively short-term stage at which primary friendship groups are formed and basic objectives are identified that are truly consistent with the individual's values system, talents, and interests. It also could serve as a highly flexible holding station for those needing compensatory education. In essence, the house would provide a platform upon which the student could build other associations. In a liberal arts college, the house would likely be a primary base for four years. In a vocationally oriented land-grant university, the house program might be a freshman year program for the majority of the students. In a large community college with many commuter students, the house might serve primarily as a place to meet people and to work between classes.

This model of a large institution having an outer ring of satellite colleges for entering students, with each such college containing several houses, and an inner ring of primarily professional schools is designed to foster a strong sense of community and to serve highly individualized personal needs. It also is designed to fit normal patterns of human development, not to force students to adjust to unrealistic programs designed for administrative convenience. To be sure, the model would need to be tailored to the circumstances of each college.

Anticipated Consequences

It seems highly likely that several consequences that might ensue from this general arrangement would be related not only to the general communitization issue, but to the other major trends which have been cited.

Stated generally, the bringing together of people with similar transcendent values should create an "esprit de corps" and generate a number of activities which would informally modify some of the most urgent needs for which new approaches have been developed. Some special problems would be created.

More specifically, the following consequences seem likely to occur:

1. Many of the recent demands for special courses in new areas of student developmental needs perhaps were generated because having such courses is often the only way to bring widely scattered people with special concerns together. Many of these concerns could well be met informally through house activities because the interested students and the faculty resource people are already closely associated.

2. The need for personalization would be taken care of naturally and informally in most cases. Students with highly similar transcendent values are likely to experience similar needs and to share the solutions they have found. The availability in the house of peer counselors and well-known faculty advisers with clear channels to more specialized resources should make most of the problems which seem unusual and difficult in the general student population quite common and resolvable in a given house.

3. Even many problems related to educational disadvantage are likely to receive attention. Almost every organization in which an "esprit de corps" develops tends to help its weaker members. It is hard to resist liking and being kind to a person with whom one has much in common. It is ego-rewarding to be able to give real help. There is also a likelihood of some rivalry developing between houses relating to the general level of capability of its members which might foster group efforts to improve performance among weaker group members. Such efforts can be constructive and helpful. They also can result in destructive pressure tactics.

4. Of equal or greater meaning to the educationally disadvantaged would be the sense of belonging, of sharing common interests. The value systems of disadvantaged students might tend to cluster them disproportionately in certain houses, as blacks now tend to self-select themselves disproportionately into the areas of sociology, political science, and education rather than into forestry or mathematics. Alternatively, it could distribute economically or ethnically identifiable groups so that each student would find himself in a cluster not noticeably related

to economic or ethnic variables, but in which he would find himself compatible and accepted despite atypical characteristics he might have. The impact of real acceptance on the basis of interests, values and talents without regard to ethnic or economic factors might well modify negative attitudes and clear the way for concentration on correctible skills and study habits.

5. Under this format, some existing types of groups would indeed have a difficult time. As one former fraternity president has stated, "Fraternities and sororities are organizations looking for a purpose." With houses organized for all entering freshmen and focused upon educationally sound transcendent values systems, fraternities and sororities would probably be hard put to justify and continue operating under their competing and less educationally justifiable implicit value systems. They could, of course, try to serve more advanced students who are attracted to them because of their transcendent values. The evidence concerning the current state of interest of upper division students in such groups does not indicate that such a course of action is viable. Perhaps the Greek system has outlived its usefulness and is an anachronism.

   On the other hand, the fraternity system probably is the best proof that exists of the tremendous power and importance of transcendent values. Perhaps the system could somehow be transformed to provide transcendent values more educationally acceptable than the economic and ethnic elitism that seem to have been the core variables in the transcendent values of the Greek system. Perhaps there are other core elements which would be elaborated and implemented so that the virtues traditionally claimed for the system could be equally available to all regardless of economic circumstances or ethnic identification.

6. Certain professional or vocational programs that have traditionally insisted on primary commitment of entering freshmen to the activities of that curriculum would need to be modified. The first priority would be to establish each student as a member of a viable and supportive community. Vocational objectives are only one aspect (although a major one) of each student's educational program and needs, whereas identifying his place and role in a community involves his total life-style. Accordingly, the vocational focus is a second-level consideration and should be placed in that perspective. Some short-term vocational programs, such as are common in community colleges, might need to be modestly lengthened. In four-year undergraduate programs, professional sequences should ordinarily begin no

earlier than the sophomore year, with the student having the option to start his major the first year, if he so desires.

7. In terms of budgetary factors, a complete and systematic elaboration of this or any similar plan is going to cost money to fully implement and develop. On the other hand, on most campuses currently experiencing problems deriving from the loss of a sense of community, much could be accomplished for very little budgetary outlay. The expenditure of professional effort in imaginative planning for better use of existing facilities and for implementing procedures might be considerable. It seems equally possible that if the present common pattern is continued, even more money and effort are likely to be used in patchwork programs and in "fire-fighting" when hostile, alienated, depersonalized students explode over some real or imagined injustice by educators whom they now tend to regard as adversaries and the perpetrators of the conditions in which they find themselves.

Curricular Specialization and Student Development

One kind of role and functional relationship of teaching personnel to entering students has been sketched in the section above. This role has some aspects that relate to a pre-professional advising function, but the more basic role is that of counselor and academic model. Such professor-counselors should be selected and rewarded not because of their specific expertise in a narrow area of professional specialization but because of their teaching and human relations ability.

When students develop to a stage where a focus on professional objectives is the dominant (but not necessarily exclusive) focus, a pattern akin to the traditional model in which the student has an adviser in his major and in which professors teach professionally oriented courses probably should continue to be used. This applies as much in community colleges as in four-year colleges and universities.

There should be, and likely will be, some differences. As the vestigial attitudes associated with "in loco parentis" continue to fade from the scene, the factors fostering unnecessary and educationally undesirable social distance between professor and student should diminish. Realistically, a second factor fostering a change of attitude and role will be the desire for self-preservation. As job markets for college graduates have become glutted, students are clearly questioning the materialistic benefits of a college education. The results show in decreasing student enrollments, particularly in four-year colleges and universities. Clearly, the meritocratic orientation which focused almost exclusively on vocational preparation is no longer a favored recruitment and retention argument in departments or schools where job prospects after graduation are scarce. Therefore, the virtues of a number of departments or professional schools are being touted as serving non-vocational interests. Some schools of education, for example, are focusing more on promoting student "self-actualization" than on selection and professional preparation of good teachers. These and other reactions indicate a likely deepening of interest in all aspects of the student's development (and the not incidental retention of the student) in many professional schools and previously vocationally oriented major departments, and the development of a sense of community involving both students and faculty.

The motivation of the faculty to obtain and keep students in departmental classes and the new trend of faculty to place greater emphasis on non-vocational offerings as a matter of self-preservation are likely to continue the trend to liberalize the curriculum. Engineering schools can offer courses related to ecology. Schools of education and departments of psychology can offer human development and sensitivity training courses. The use of leisure, the politics of peace, and multicultural appreciation courses can be legitimately offered by social science departments. The restrictions of the meritocratic focus on vocationalism and the even older focus on learning how to deal with ideas (as opposed to dealing with people or things) are being much modified even in professional schools.

Despite these trends toward utilizing the curriculum to provide educational opportunities for non-vocational purposes, ours is still basically a work-oriented society, especially if one views work as productive and socially beneficial endeavors which challenge the deepest interests and are consistent with the transcendent values of the individual.

In essence, it seems reasonable to expect that students who establish the feeling of belonging which should be fostered by the compatible transcendent values of the outer ring house would differentiate among alternatives related to that cluster and eventually "graduate" to a realistic vocational program compatible with their chosen life-style. For many, the process would take a relatively few months; for some it might take years. Those who make this vocational commitment would, in effect, be identifying themselves with a new sub-community compatible with their evolving educational needs.

Whenever the student does make such a vocational or professional commitment, what should occur is immediate and rapid identification of the student as a perhaps young but adult professional-in-training who should be encouraged to regard his professors as models and friends, and who is regarded by them as a junior colleague and apprentice professional.

These professional communities also need facilities in which they can congregate. Again, the Claremont Men's College Center comes to mind as a model. Activities might range from those directly related to a curricular project, to informal sessions by distinguished visiting professors, to Friday afternoon beer busts. Indeed barriers to social interaction should be removed, whether they be archaic blue laws, departmental customs, or indifferent attitudes on the part of certain professors.

The Campus Assistance Center

Whether an admissions policy is open or selective, there will be students admitted who are found to have special needs and problems not met by the informal or formal aspects of the system previously described or by any other system logically developed to meet most of their needs. Help for these students must not only be available, but also be readily accessible. It must be constructive, not destructive. It must also be timely; that is, it must reach the student before the situation becomes hopeless. Further, the agency which is to provide the help must have real power to act constructively.

The first requirement is that direct contact must be made with the student. On most campuses, under the existing system, the great majority of students with problems must be highly self-actualized and exercise considerable initiative to overcome psychological and bureaucratic barriers to receive the help they need. By definition, most students with severe problems lack this confidence and skill; customarily they either receive help from non-institutional sources or fall by the wayside. One needs only to survey freshman attrition rates to confirm this phenomenon.

For this reason, an activist agency, the Campus Assistance Center, should be established to make contact with students having significant problems. Basically, this agency should be similar to the University of Minnesota's Campus Assistance Center, the Student Assistance Center at Mexico State University, the walk-in counseling offices at Moraine Valley Community College, or the satellite counseling center at the University of California at Santa Barbara.

Characteristics and Functions

This Campus Assistance Center should have the following characteristics and functions:

1. It should be a gateway or portal agency behind which are all the more highly specialized student development resources of the institution.

2. Peer counselors and other paraprofessionals should constitute the majority of the personnel on this staff to avoid the over-professionalized image that sometimes inhibits the effectiveness of highly specialized agencies. The center should particularly avoid attaining a psychological, medical or administrative image which suggests that students who use its services are either sick or subject to implicitly coercive action. This factor seems most critical for students from less advantaged backgrounds who seldom have come into contact with these kinds of professionals except in dire emergencies.

3. The offices of the agency should be located on what is considered to be student "turf." The agency certainly should not be buried among the central administration offices, nor surrounded by instructional facilities and professors' offices.

4. Although students would be welcomed at the central office of this agency, part of the program should be the kind of roving counselor outreach activity similar to that at the University of Northern Colorado. Staff members should be assigned the task of seeking out students where they congregate to attempt to discover endemic problems that the institution can correct and to foster the concept that the center actively is seeking students who may need help.

5. In a similar fashion, this staff should seek out specific individuals who have been identified by other sources as showing signs of needing help. These sources can include probation committees, residence hall personnel, disciplinary committees, or professors.

6. At the head of this agency should be a highly capable and respected administrator having the responsibility and authority to take constructive action to alleviate student problems where such action is clearly to the educational benefit of the student. Essential among the powers of this individual would be that of authorizing re-evaluation and re-direction procedures similar to those employed at Ferris State College. Included in these procedures could be provision for effectively reviewing the results of initial academic misdirection, perhaps resembling the grade deletion policy of Northern Arizona University. High standards for graduation are probably necessary; punitive action for initial ignorance is not.

The Center as Activist Ombudsman

In overall effect, the Campus Assistance Center would function as an activist ombudsman with staff. Indeed, the ombudsman phenomenon itself represents a recognition of the gap that needs to be filled. Ombudsmen very often have been given powers to cut across jurisdictional lines and take extraordinary actions for the benefit of students when those powers and actions have been denied to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

It should be noted that whereas policy-making boards may be considered necessary, such boards cannot be permitted to strip the center administration of effective power to serve the students' legitimate educational needs. A policy-making board for such an agency might well consist of equal representation of students, student development specialists, and teaching faculty. It should be directly responsible to the president, not to any intermediate group likely to be dominated by interests and values other than those which place the educational development of students as the highest priority. This concept may run counter to the concept of faculty rights and prerogatives at many institutions, especially at those where students have fared poorly in the past.

Resource and Referral Agencies

Backing up the personnel dealing most directly with students in these reorientations and realignments of roles should be a cadre of student development specialists with high levels of expertise. However, the people who possess the potential to serve as consultants and specialists and who, in effect, must provide much of the guidance in developing the new structure, will themselves often need to assume new professional postures and orientations. Such changes will require high levels of maturity, self-confidence, and flexibility. In short, they will need to know very well what they are doing, and even more important, *why* they are doing it.

Specialized Group Services

With the shifting of the basic structure of the student development system from the traditional highly centralized and monolithic pattern to the houses and outer ring colleges for entering students, and to the professional schools or departments for more advanced students, the respective roles of a centralized student activities office, student government structures, and similar agencies are both diminished and radically altered in nature.

Student activities offices traditionally have been geared primarily to foster mass functions aimed mostly at unmarried, lower-division students. They have been almost forced to use a "lowest common denominator" approach. For more specialized groups, their function has been mainly that of a clearinghouse.

Similarly, student government activities have been marked by almost universal apathy, except by a few opportunists with highly personal objectives in mind. Student government programs in large institutions often serve no significant group of students very well except the student officers themselves.

As a consequence of these problems, the educational contribution of these programs can be described as generally minimal and serving only a very few well.

Under the house system, student activities specialists might well continue to manage some mass enterprises of interest to many students in the larger institution such as concerts and special events, as well as to function in a clearinghouse capacity. But their role as consultants and advisers would be much elaborated.

A centralized student government, on the other hand, would serve less as a pseudo-spokesman for all the students, and more as a pipeline for communicating and coordinating concerns of the various relatively homogeneous self-governing groups.

Specialized Psychological Services

A generation or so ago, anything having to do with psychology tended to be associated with mental illness by the general public including most college students. Consequently, the euphemism of "counseling center" was used on many campuses to refer to psychological service centers. Similarly, "counselor" was used to refer to the clinical and counseling psychologists that manned such centers. Therefore, most counseling centers on four-year campuses are actually primarily psychological service centers, and most of the counselors are de facto psychologists of various levels of skill and sophistication. For a variety of reasons, community college counselors tend more to be counseling generalists.

The use of these euphemisms has been a source of much confusion. It also has caused students, faculty, and administrators to assume that counseling, i.e., direct face-to-face interaction with students, was or should be the almost exclusive function of such a center. As has been noted, this is often a waste of professional time and skill. Because sound information about the nature of the student population is essential to educational program planning and decision making as well as to good counseling, perhaps the most significant activity of this agency should be research focusing most specifically on the needs and characteristics of students within the institution. Much of the research should be of a very practical nature. Such research is not likely to be highly publishable because it breaks little new theoretical ground. Second in importance should be the role of consultant, functioning in an outreach fashion to work with counseling generalists, administrators, and teaching faculty. A related function is that of trainers of professional and paraprofessional staff both in the houses and in general counseling agencies such as the Campus Assistance Center. The role they should play might well be modeled at least in part upon that at Colorado State University.

Finally, these specialists must also be prepared to work personally and directly with individual students whose problems are beyond the capabilities of counseling generalists, including paraprofessionals. Utilizing the principle that priority should be given to those services which do the most good for the most people, this counseling role may well have the lowest priority among the functions of these specialists.

Special Services for Ethnic Minority Groups and the Educationally Disadvantaged

To some extent the need for special services to minority groups and disadvantaged is transitory. Less clearly identifiable clusters of individuals need much the same kinds of help. Accordingly, a number of services useful to these groups are becoming part of the general system of many colleges (e.g., human development courses, vestibule programs, etc.), and there is a likelihood that such services will become less separate. They may well become integral aspects of larger units, such as has happened at Michigan State University and at El Centro Community College.

Curiously, the success of these special services may reach a peak, then no longer be needed.

Other Specialized Services

There are a number of other specialized service areas which could and should have an educational focus. These agencies include those offering financial aid, career counseling and placement, medical services and several others. Again, the expertise and research findings of these specialists should be included in decision-making processes in almost every aspect of institutional operation affecting students. Similarly, in most instances they should be regarded basically as resources and referral agencies.

Coordinating Resource and Referral Agencies

Given the greater availability of counseling generalists in the houses and in the Campus Assistance Center to serve students directly, the major concern is to utilize these resource people efficiently. This involves long-range planning, research, and planned modifications made in *anticipation* of changing student needs, not simply in *reaction* to emerging problems. Further, it involves cooperation and flexible interaction among people who often have been essentially isolated. There may be virtue on some campuses in gathering many of these student development specialists into one central facility, such as a Human Resources Center, especially if doing so relieves the specialists involved of the image of being administrators. The University of Maryland seems to be evolving a coordinated program designed to make better use of the expertise of people with varying types and levels of skills in several human resources areas.

Institutional Organizational Structure

It is in developing an organizational structure that the fundamental shift in the underlying philosophy of higher education becomes most obvious. In essence, the shift is from a primary focus on *subject-matter* developments to *student* development. The curriculum, whatever its form, is to serve the student--not vice versa.

Given this assumption, it logically follows that administrative control of the curriculum should be in the hands of the administrators charged with primary responsibility for student development. This is *not* to say that the specific content of given courses, nor the establishing of requirements for completion of a given kind of curriculum should not be the responsibility of subject-matter experts. However, it does strongly indicate that, for those aspects of their total work load that touch directly on student development, instructional personnel and departments should expect to be responsible to the chief student development executive, perhaps a Vice President for Curricular Affairs and Student Development.

On the other hand, for activities in research, consulting, public service, and professional development, they could well expect to report to someone else, perhaps a Vice President for Research, Faculty Affairs, and Community Services.

Obviously, this would require close cooperation, joint planning, and carefully developed policies and procedures in the control of faculty time as well as in systems having to do with assessing faculty merit. Faculty who have a high interest in student development and whose primary interest is in teaching and working with students probably would find the system quite beneficial to their real interests because all their contributions would be more fairly weighted. Indeed, there should be no particular problem with research-oriented professors unless they have teaching and advising assignments in which they do a poor job. Under the traditional system, such professors suffered few negative consequences. Under the suggested system, their inadequacies as well as their outstanding attributes would receive appropriate attention.

It should be noted that such evaluations might well foster systematic re-orientation of another sort in research-oriented colleges and universities. It is time to drop the pretense that all the professional staff should be in the institution to educate students, and that research and consulting should be secondary concerns for all faculty. From a practical point of view, this is unworkable. Some excellent researchers should never be allowed to teach. Likewise, some excellent teachers are pitiful researchers. Although most colleges and many universities are basically teaching institutions and always have been, it now should be recognized that research and community services have become parallel to, and to a large extent independent of, the educational function of the institution. Why is it necessary to maintain the pretense that an excellent researcher must teach at least a handful of graduate students in at least one seminar every year? Or that that producer of sports extravaganzas, the athletic director, as well as his staff of coaches, are really educators? Both of these kinds of professional activities provide high-quality services to meet important needs and demands of the constituency of the institution. But their relationship to the educational development of students is tangential at best. Because these functions are now essentially separate from the truly educative functions, at least as they relate to regularly enrolled students, it would seem logical to recognize frankly the real situation and let researchers research, teachers teach, and coaches coach, with appropriate rewards for excellence in each case.

With regard to matters of discipline and control, students should have adult status equal to that of senior professors. Whatever control functions need to be exercised should be the concern of one or more of the following: (a) a house or "college" self-government board, (b) an institution-wide board responsible for disciplinary functions involving any scholar (i.e., student, professor, counselor, or administrator), (c) a person well trained in law who would report directly to the president. This person would handle campus security and traffic matters. He would also take care of disturbances on campus property including not only those involving students in residence halls but also those involving faculty or campus visitors (e.g., at football games). In short, student development specialists should get out of the discipline and student-control business.

What basically is being suggested is that the traditional organizational structure appropriate to the small teaching institution of yesteryear be restructured to fit the realities of today. "In loco parentis" is dead but vestigial attitudes remain. Let a system be devised which suitably organizes the institution to recognize these changes. Let parallel, noncompeting systems of rewards for educators be developed. Above all, let those who are interested in educational development of students be encouraged, aided, and rewarded for effective efforts to educate students in all aspects of their lives.

Taken together, the restoring of a sense of community through the house plan or similar development, the greater involvement of teaching faculty including the provision of a broader array of non-vocational curricular offerings, the institution of an activist, non-threatening Campus Assistance Center, the more efficient utilization of student development expertise, and a more functionally logical administrative structure should greatly enhance the educational effectiveness of the college or university. This enhanced effectiveness should occur not simply as a result of the cumulative activities of each program but from the interaction that takes place because the program is an organized, integral one, not a piecemeal, jury-rigged, patch-upon-patch program that "grew like Topsy."

For a variety of reasons, the time seems to be particularly fortuitous for many institutions to review how they are serving their students. The integrated student development concept outlined above may well provide a viable model to be used with local modifications and elaborations.

On the other hand, practical considerations and unrecognized or unanticipated new variables may well indicate the need to develop alternative models.

The critical factor for educators who consider themselves to be real professionals is that the restructuring and development of colleges and universities be undertaken to foster some positive educational values and concepts. Otherwise, institutions of higher education by and large will continue to be the products of more or less blind reaction to political and social pressures with unfortunate consequences for students and declining respect for college educators.

It has been said that "The wheels of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly fine." The wheels are grinding. The direction of many trends seems obvious. By foresight, planning, and effort, perhaps it is possible to accelerate and facilitate the evolution of college student development with considerable benefit to students, educators, and higher education as a whole, and society in general.

Capsule Summary

Application of the new approaches to student development can, of course, be made through direct, essentially imitative efforts with local adaptations and embellishments. More effective would be the utilization of principles and examples in an orderly, systematic, and integrated fashion. By appropriate combinations and elaborations, a system might well be developed incorporating all basic principles and meeting all the systematic needs represented by basic trends.

A model is suggested based on a "house" plan for sub-communities of entering students and upon a second system of sub-communities for more advanced students organized primarily around professionally oriented majors. The plan incorporates the major principles identified as essential to a community and is designed to integrate students and faculty, instructional services and student development services into a systematic program based on established principles of student development.

This community-oriented model seems likely to meet in an informal natural fashion many of the needs for which special formal programs are being developed. Such informal methods of accommodating student needs are now lacking in existing structures.

To augment the system of cohesive sub-communities, a Campus Assistance Center concept was suggested utilizing peer counselors and other professionals to provide first-line personalized assistance.

Backing these sub-community and personal assistance programs would be highly professional student development specialists who would provide the general direction for these programs and also serve resource and referral functions.

These student development programs would be combined with curricular programs as well as with research, community service, and other activities of a college or university into an organizational structure far different from the traditional economically and ethnically elitist, meritocratic model based upon a hierarchical feudal concept. Instead, the organizational structure would be one in which the diverse functions of a modern college or university are organized into an integral, functionally related structure appropriate to serve not only the educational needs of students but also the other legitimate needs which a modern democratic society expects to be served by a community of scholars.

IX. REFERENCES

Berte, N. R. & Upshaw, C. Student life studies: An action research option. *National Association of Student Personnel Administration Journal*, 1971, 9, 77-80.

Brown, R. D. Student development in an experimental college, or I may have seen a unicorn. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1972, 13, 196-201.

Brown, R. D. *Student development in tomorrow's higher education--a return to the academy*. Student Personnel Series No. 16, Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1972.

Cross, K. P. New students and new contours in student personnel administration. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1972, 35, 49-58.

Dockus, K. Walk-in counseling service. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1972, 50, 835-836.

Grant, S. *Call to action: A committee report with recommendations for action*. Sacramento, California: California Junior College Association, Committee on the Disadvantaged, 1968.

Green, R. L. The black quest for higher education: An admissions dilemma. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1969, 47, 905-911.

Harper, F. G. Media for change; black students in the white university. *Journal of Negro Education*, 1971, 40, 255-265.

Katz, J. The challenge to "body ofknowledge" learning from the person-centered advocates. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges, January, 1972.

Mann, C. A. & Phelps, F. D. College open admissions--a humanistic venture? Paper presented at the International Conference on Humanistic Psychology, Wivizburg, West Germany, July, 1971.

Mead, M. *And keep your powder dry*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1965.

O'Banion, T. *New directions in community college student personnel programs*. Student Personnel Series No. 15. Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association, 1971.

Penney, J. F. Student personnel work; a profession stillborn. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*. 1969, 47, 958-962.

Phenix, P. H. *Realms of meaning; a philosophy of the curriculum in general education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Quality of educational life, priorities for today. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1972, 1-13.

Roche Laboratories. *Roche Report: Frontiers of psychiatry*, 1972, 2 (13), 1-5.

Salinger, M. D., Tollefson, A. L., & Hudson, R. I. The catalytic function of the counselor. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1960, 38, 648-652.

Southern Regional Education Board. *The black community and the community college*. Atlanta, Georgia: Author, 1970.

Southern Regional Education Board. *The college and cultural diversity*. Atlanta, Georgia: Author, 1971.

Toffler, A. *Future shock*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Tollefson, A. L., & Bristow, R. M. Philosophy of student personnel services: An integralist point of view and functional relations concept. *Proceedings, First Annual Meeting, Student Personnel Association of California Colleges*, 1964, 8-21.

Wallenfeldt, E. C. Student personnel work in the electric age. *NASPA Journal*, 1971, 9, 111-118.

Walz, G. R. Technology in guidance; a conceptual overview. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1970, 49, 175-182.

Wilkenson, R. D. Student services and the human development dilemma. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, March 1970.

Williamson, E. G. *Student personnel services in college and universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Wrenn, C. G. Reflections and directions in higher education. In J. M. Whitley (Ed.), Students in the University and in Society. Student Personnel Series No. 13. Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association, 1970.

Wrenn, C. G. The World of the Contemporary Counselor. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

APPENDIX A - Letter 1

HUMAN INTERACTION RESEARCH INSTITUTE
KIRKEBY CENTER, SUITE 610 · 10889 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 879-1373

June 23, 1972

Dear Colleague:

That student personnel administrators and other student development specialists are under particular stress these days is a fact of which Institutional Representatives of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and all other student personnel professionals are acutely aware.

A study designed to identify, evaluate, and collate new ideas and techniques which could be of value in alleviating this stress has been funded by the Office of Education. The title of the project is "New Approaches to Student Development Programs." The Human Interaction Research Institute is the grantee organization and I am the principal investigator.

The grant application has been reviewed by the Research Division of NASPA. This group has expressed its interest and endorsement of the project as being of considerable potential value to student personnel educators.

The Human Interaction Research Institute (HIRI) is an independent, academically related, non-profit organization engaged in research, education and consultation pertaining to problems, opportunities and development of people. In addition to its central office staff, it has some thirty staff associates including scholars and professional persons from a variety of fields, many of whom are primarily affiliated with colleges and universities. My own basic position is Professor of Education and Coordinator of the College Student Personnel Administration Graduate Program at Oregon State University. Some other HIRI associates include Dr. C. Gilbert Wrenn and Dr. Clifford G. Houston who are well known in student personnel circles.

Since you and your colleagues in student personnel work are intended to be the primary beneficiaries of this project, we hope that you will take a little time to help us get the project underway. What we need are nominations from you of promising techniques, procedures and activities which student development programs can use in assisting students of all types, but especially disadvantaged, minority, alienated or other atypical students, in their educational development.

More specifically, we seek to identify:

a) better ways of introducing students to college;

b) better ways to help students modify those attitudes and values which may need to be changed for them to achieve their goals;

c) ways to modify attitudes, methods and operational procedures of student personnel and other specialists in cases where this may help them in their role of facilitating student development;

d) exemplary curricular offerings, including specially designed innovative programs;

e) effective administrative structures to support the above.

If you know of some institution which is making noteworthy progress along these lines, or is doing some specific good things in a limited area, would you please tell us its name, address and the name of the individual who can inform us about what is being done. Perhaps you know of several such programs. Since you are particularly knowledgeable about your own program, please don't be modest or reticent about your own efforts. We are interested in any promising program, whether in a university, four-year college or a community college.

Please send your reply to me at the following address:

Dr. Arthur L. Tollefson
9707 Tampico Road
Corvallis, Oregon 97330

Thank you for giving this request your thoughtful consideration. Be assured that we will give every nomination our careful attention.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur L. Tollefson

Arthur L. Tollefson, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

ALT:as

APPENDIX A - Letter 2

HUMAN INTERACTION RESEARCH INSTITUTE
KIRKEBY CENTER, SUITE 610 · 10889 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 879-1373

Dear Colleague:

This letter is a request for your help. I am engaged in a research grant from the Office of Education entitled "New Approaches to College Student Development," for which the contracting agency is the Human Interaction Research Institute. Since my primary time commitment for working on this project is for the summer, I would very much appreciate your help in getting this study underway.

What we are looking for to include in our study are nominations of promising college student development techniques and procedures which may not be generally known but which, if identified and disseminated, could be used by programs on other campuses to help students succeed, especially the disadvantaged or alienated student.

In essence, what we hope to do is to help students of the "new breed" obtain the kinds of educational benefits they need, and to aid beleaguered student personnel educators to become aware of promising and successful new approaches that have been developed throughout the country.

More specifically, we seek to identify:

a) better ways of introducing students to college;

b) better ways to help students become aware of any behavior patterns (and perhaps related underlying values or attitudes) they may have brought with them that appear to be seriously counter-productive to their own ostensible goals in attending college;

c) ways of encouraging student personnel staff and related specialists to consider reviewing their attitudes and operational procedures that bear upon the goal of facilitating optimal student development;

d) better curricular offerings, including specially designed innovative programs;

e) better administrative structures to support the above.

If you know of some institution which is making noteworthy progress along these lines, or is doing some specific good things in a limited area, please give us the name, address and institutional affiliation of the individual who can inform us about what is being done. Perhaps you know of several such programs. Since you are particularly knowledgeable about your own program, please don't be modest or reticent about your own efforts. We are interested in any promising program, whether in a university, four-year college, or a community college.

Please indicate the reasons you believe the nominated program has particular value and should be included in this project.

I sincerely believe that this project can provide a pool of techniques and ideas of value to student personnel workers far beyond the limits of the report, which in itself should be of considerable interest to almost everyone in the field. That other knowledgeable people agree is indicated by the fact that the Research Committee of NASPA has expressed considerable interest in the project and has given it their endorsement. However, I consider you and others who receive this letter to be the primary source of nominations. I have included each of you because there are very specific reasons to believe you are far more aware and knowledgeable about such programs and procedures than would be true for most people involved in student development roles.

Please send your reply to me at the following address:

Dr. Arthur L. Tollefson
9707 Tampico Road
Corvallis, Oregon 97330

Thank you for your cooperation and contribution to what I hope will be a substantive addition to the field of student development.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur L. Tollefson, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

ALT:as

APPENDIX B

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The listing below includes all institutions having one or more programs cited in this report. With a few exceptions, the name of a specific individual has been identified as a resource person to whom inquiries may be addressed. These are not necessarily the individuals directly responsible for the program, especially in larger institutions having several programs which were described. Given the mobility of college educators, in some instances it is possible that personnel changes may have occurred.

Name of College or University	Resource Person
California State Universities and Colleges	Maggi Phillips EPIC Assistant Director California State University Northridge, California 91324
City University of New York	Glen T. Nygreen Dean of Students and Professor of Sociology Herbert Lehman College Bedford Park Boulevard West Bronx, New York 10468
Claremont Men's College	Clifton T. McLeod Dean of Students Bauer Center Claremont Men's College Claremont, California 91711
Colorado State University	Ursula Delworth Paraprofessional Program Coordinator University Counseling Center Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

Name of College or University	Resource Person
Davis and Elkins College	Carl D. Swanson Chairman, Psychology Department and Division of Social Science Davis and Elkins College Elkins, West Virginia 26241
De Paul University	Joseph E. O'Neill, C. S. C. Dean of Students De Paul University 2323 North Seminary Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60614
Dutchess Community College	Freda R. H. Martens Director of Institutional Research/ Assistant to the President Dutchess Community College Pendell Road Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
El Centro College	Don G. Creamer Dean of Students El Centro College Main and Lamar Dallas, Texas 75202
Ferris State College	Malcolm D. Salinger Educational Counselor Ferris State College Big Rapids, Michigan 49307
Friends World College	George H. Watson Moderator Friends World College Lloyd Harbor Huntington, New York 11743
Fulton-Montgomery Community College	George P. Pilkey Director of Advisement Counseling and Testing Fulton-Montgomery Community College Johnstown, New York 12095

Name of College or University	Resource Person
Kendall College	James McHolland Director of Human Potential Project Kendall College Evanston, Illinois 60204
Lafayette College	Herman C. Kissiah Dean of Students Lafayette College Easton, Pennsylvania 18042
Herbert H. Lehman College	Glen T. Nygreen Dean of Students and Professor of Sociology Herbert Lehman College Bedford Park Boulevard West Bronx, New York 10468
Lewis and Clark College	Kent Hawley Dean of Students Lewis and Clark College Portland, Oregon 97219
Loretto Heights College	Adele Phelan Dean of Student Services Loretto Heights College 3001 South Federal Boulevard Denver, Colorado 80236
Manhattan College	Jerome P. Cashman Vice President for Student Services Manhattan College Manhattan College Parkway Bronx, New York 10471
Manhattanville College	Harold C. Cannon Dean of the College Manhattanville College Purchase, New York 10577
Michigan State University	Donald Coleman Office of Black Affairs Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Name of College or University	Resource Person
Mount Royal College	Barney Demicell Counsellor Department of Student and Community Services Mount Royal College 1129 - 7th Avenue S.W. Calgary, Alberta, Canada
New England College	David L. Ebert Dean of Students New England College Henniker, New Hampshire 03242
New Mexico State University	Richard E. Pesqueira Vice President - Student Affairs New Mexico State University Box 3549 Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001
North Carolina Central University	Glen R. Martin Director of Counseling North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina 27707
Northeastern University	Christopher F. Kennedy Dean of Students Northeastern University Boston, Massachusetts 02115
Northern Arizona University	Robert C. Dickeson Vice Provost for Student Affairs Northern Arizona University Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Oklahoma State University	Robert G. Schmalfeld Dean of Student Affairs Student Union 370 Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074
Oregon State University	George Stevens Director of the Memorial Union Oregon State University Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Name of College or University	Resource Person
Pacific Lutheran University	Philip E. Beal Vice President for Student Life Pacific Lutheran University Tacoma, Washington 98447
Rochester Institute of Technology	Fred W. Smith Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Contemporary Education Rochester Institute of Technology One Lomb Drive Rochester, New York 14623
Rutgers University	Virginia O. Record Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey 0890
Santa Fe Community College	George Huber Director, Educational Planning Santa Fe Community College PO Box 1530 3000 N.W. 83rd Street Gainesville, Florida 32601
Stanford University	John D. Black Coordinator of Research Office of the Dean of Students Stanford University Stanford, California 94305
St. Petersburg Junior College	Luther E. Davis, Jr. Assistant Dean of Student Affairs Central Administration St. Petersburg Junior College PO Box 13489 St. Petersburg, Florida 33733
Tuskegee Institute	Rosa A. Fuller Associate Dean of Student Affair Residence Life and Developmen Tuskegee Institute Tuskegee, Alabama 36088

Name of College or University	Resource Person
United States International University	Jack Edling Vice President United States International University 8655 Pomerado Road San Diego, California 92124
University of Alabama	Neal R. Berte Dean, New College PO Box 6211 University of Alabama University, Alabama 35486
University of California - Santa Barbara	Lyle G. Reynolds Dean of Students University of California Santa Barbara, California 93106
University of Denver	Walter B. Shaw Dean Office of Housing Programs University of Denver University Park Denver, Colorado 80210
University of Kansas	William M. Balfour Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs University of Kansas Lawrence, Kansas 66044
University of Maryland	Thomas M. Magoon Director University Counseling Center University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742
University of Minnesota	Ludwig J. Spolyar Director, Campus Assistance Center University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
University of Nebraska	Dean, Centennial College University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska 68508